Daily Report

East Europe

FBIS-EEU-92-050
Friday
13 March 1992

Daily Report
East Europe

FBIS-EEU-92-050 13 March 1992

CONTENTS

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

FRONT PAGE

BULGARIA

Dimitrov Comments on 'Successful' Visit to U.S. *[BTA]* 2
Prime Minister Denies Change in IMF Attitude *[BTA]* 2
World Bank Official Cited on Loan Delay *[Vienna DIE PRESSE 11 Mar]* 2
BSP Insists Demonstrations 'Peaceful' *[BTA]* 3
Pensioners Hold Countrywide Protest Rallies *[BTA]* 3
Bessarabian, Tauric Bulgarians Want To Return *[BTA]* 3

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Czech, Slovak Prime Ministers Discuss 'Barriers' *[Prague TV]* 4
Carnogursky: Bratislava Rally Has No Significance *[CSTK]* 4
Reaction to Slovak Anniversary Plans Reported *[CSTK]* 4
Bratislava Mayor Refuses To Ban 14 Mar Rally *[Prague Radio]* 5
Slovak Independence Demonstration Draws 700 *[CSTK]* 5
Dubcek Cited on Federal State, 14 Mar Rally *[CSTK]* 5
Slovak 'Initiatives' Urge Sovereignty Declaration *[CSTK]* 5
Czech 'Concern' About Ties With Slovaks Noted *[HOSPODARSKE NOVINY 10 Mar]* 6
Havel 'Afraid' of Presidential Election Problems *[MLADA FRONTA DNES 10 Mar]* 6
'Late Receipt' Delays FRG Treaty Ratification *[LIDOVE NOVINY 10 Mar]* 7
Deputy Minister on Trade Prospects With Ukraine *[Prague Radio]* 7
Government Approves Soviet Troop, Radio Bills *[CSTK]* 7

HUNGARY

Goncz: Relations With Romania 'Priority' Issue *[CURIERUL NATIONAL 6 Mar]* 9
Defense Minister's Adviser Views Security Policy *[MAGYAR HIRLAP 10 Mar]* 9
Donations Arrive To Fund Moscow TV Broadcasts *[MTI]* 10

POLAND

Center Accord Faces Internal Tension *[PAP]* 11
Splinter Group Criticized *[PAP]* 11
Call To Broaden Ruling Coalition *[PAP]* 11
Walesa Meets With Newspaper Representatives *[Warsaw Radio]* 11

ROMANIA

FSN Steering Collegium Meets With Iliescu *[Bucharest Radio]* 13
Senator Solcanu Criticizes Roman *[ROMPRES]* 13
Press Views FSN 'Discontent' *[ROMPRES]* 13
Nastase Comments on Brussels Meeting, Moldova *[ROMPRES]* 14
Activities in Brussels *[cross-reference]* 14
Ministry 'Pleased' With U.S. Election Assessment *[Bucharest Radio]* 14
Moldovan Envoy Hopes for Political Settlement *[ROMPRES]* 15
New Cooperation Treaty Signed With Germany *[ROMPRES]* 15
Envoy Views Issues Nastase To Discuss in Moscow *[ROMPRES]* 15
CD Advocates Union With Bessarabia, Bukovina *[ROMANIA LIBERA 10 Mar]* 16
Defense Minister Comments on Security Issues *[ROMPRES]* 16

YUGOSLAVIA

International

UN Envoy Vance Satisfied With Visit *[TANJUG]* 17
UN Commander Satish Meets Croatian Officials *[TANJUG]* 17

Federal

JNA Buys POW Corpses from Croatians *[TANJUG]* 17
Special Status Requested for UN-Protected Areas *[TANJUG]* 18
Deputies Demand End to Illegal Arms Imports *[TANJUG]* 18
Cooperation in Federal Tank Production Viewed *[POLITIKA 26 Feb]* 18

Bosnia-Hercegovina

EC Considers Serbian Rejection 'Big Mistake' *[TANJUG]* 19
'Differing Views on Geography' Hinder Map *[TANJUG]* 19
Government Proclaims Referendum Successful *[Sarajevo Radio]* 20
SDS Claims Irregularities *[TANJUG]* 20
Civilians Open Fire on Troops at Capljina *[TANJUG]* 20

Croatia

Serbian Leaders Comment on Refugees, Krajina *[VJESNIK 28 Feb]* 20

Serbia

Milosevic Reportedly Under House Arrest *[Ljubljana Radio]* 23
'Small Group' Continues Belgrade Youth Rally *[TANJUG]* 23
Youth Assembly Founded *[Belgrade Radio]* 23
Party Proposes Formation of 'Opposition Bloc' *[Belgrade Radio]* 23
Radical Party Demands New Currency *[Belgrade Radio]* 24
Foreign Minister Comments on EC, U.S. Policy *[Belgrade TV]* 24
Draskovic Condemns Atrocities by Serbs *[DANAS 18 Feb]* 26

Slovenia

Rupel Sends Message to Baker on Recognition *[Ljubljana Radio]* 30
Council of Europe Delegation Arrives for Talks *[Ljubljana Radio]* 30

Bulgaria

Upon his return from a 10-day visit to the United States, Prime Minister Filip Dimitrov said reports that the IMF had changed its attitude toward Bulgaria "do not correspond to the truth," BTA reports. Dimitrov noted that IMF and World Bank delegations had visited Bulgaria in February and had agreed to conditions under which the second tranche of the World bank's "structural adjustment loan" would be released to the nation. These conditions were "the amendment of the Land Act and the drafting of a programme on the first steps in privatization." Vienna's DIE PRESSE quotes a World Bank official's "sobering warning" that "it is better to wait with the loans than to permit their inefficient waste." Financial "experts" say Bulgaria "is considerably lagging behind with its reform."

In response to a statement by Interior Ministry's Press Center a Bulgarian Socialist Party (BSP) leader Zhan Videnov went on national television to declare that the "attempts to describe today's pensioners' rallies...as a threat to the national security are demagogic attempts" to hide "the real problems" in society. BTA reports Videnov called on BSP supporters to hold "peaceful rallies" on 14 and 21 March.

Poland

Center Accord (PC) Chairman Jaroslaw Kaczynski said "there were good prospects" for broadening the ruling coalition, after a meeting with Prime Minister Jan Olszewski, PAP reports. Kaczynski there was "an opening...still subject to negotiation" to include the Democratic Union (UD) in the coalition. Earlier, "some 140 activists" of the PC had criticized Kaczynski's "recent attempts" to include the UD in the coalition as "actions" to "undermine the government's position."

Romania

The Steering Collegium of the FSN agreed to President Ion Iliescu's request that they meet so that the president could learn the opinion of the Collegium members on "the standpoints and statements of Mr. Roman," Bucharest radio reports. Prior to the committee's vote on a motion to meet with the president, Petre Roman reportedly asked the Collegium to decide "whether a meeting with President Iliescu was advantageous," because the president holds a position outside the party. Reporting on the meeting, Bucharest radio states that, after 26 committee members had spoken, President Iliescu "could not tell whether or not the members of the steering body agreed with Roman's statements."

Yugoslavia

Federal—TANJUG reports that the Yugoslav People's Army (JNA) had to "buy" back "the bodies of 13 of its soldiers killed in the fighting, paying 100 German marks per body" from "local chiefs" in the "secessionist Yugoslav Republic of Croatia." In a report to a session of the Federal Parliament Committee for Human Rights, JNA Colonel Miodrag Starcevic also added that "relatives of many captured soldiers were struggling to find 1,000 marks" the price of freedom for JNA soldiers in Croatian prisons."

Serbia—TANJUG reports that the student rally held in Belgrade to mark the first anniversary of student demonstrations "continues this morning with a small group of most persistent young people." The students are demanding "free media" and "the resignation of Serbian President Slobodan Milosevic." The students expressed "particular bitterness" over the fact that the Democratic Party did not support the rally and instead issued a statement saying "it does not approve the political engagement of juveniles and has nothing to do with urging the pupils to go to the streets."

Dimitrov Comments on 'Successful' Visit to U.S.

AU1203155992 Sofia BTA in English 1517 GMT 12 Mar 92

[Text] Sofia, March 12 (BTA)—Bulgarian Prime Minister Filip Dimitrov described his visit to the United States as successful. The Bush administration took a clear-cut position in favour of Bulgaria, stating that the country has made a successful step forward, that it could be trusted and should no longer be set apart from Czecho-Slovakia, Hungary and Poland, Mr. Dimitrov told the press shortly after his return to Bulgaria.

According to the Bulgarian premier, the U.S. political support is of extreme importance for Bulgaria, for its place in the world and is a recognition of the democratization that has taken part in the country so far. Mr. Dimitrov said that the U.S. Administration showed its recognition of the fact that the new Bulgarian Government is firmly committed to the reform process aimed at creating democratic institutions and a free market.

Another important result of this visit, according to Mr. Dimitrov, is the increased interest on the part of the U.S. business community towards Bulgaria. Mr. Dimitrov said that one of the reasons for this interest lies in the attitude of the U.S. Administration and its full support for the recently established U.S.-Bulgarian Investment Fund.

Premier Filip Dimitrov was in the United States for 10 days. This was the first visit of a Bulgarian prime minister in the history of relations with the United States since the beginning of the century. Mr. Dimitrov was received by President Bush who interrupted his election tour specially for this purpose. Mr. Dimitrov also had meetings with U.S. administration officials and businessmen. Mr. Dimitrov had talks with UN Secretary General Butrus Ghali in New York.

Prime Minister Denies Change in IMF Attitude

AU1203155492 Sofia BTA in English 1505 GMT 12 Mar 92

[Text] Sofia, March 12 (BTA)—The reports that the International Monetary Fund had changed its attitude to Bulgaria do not correspond to the truth, Prime Minister Filip Dimitrov told journalists today upon his return from a ten-day visit to the United States where he met representatives of the IMF and of other international financial institutions.

IMF and World Bank missions visited Bulgaria in February and then we discussed the timing and the conditions for granting the IMF stand-by arrangement and the second tranche of the World Bank's structural adjustment loan, the prime minister said. According to him, the stand of the two institutions was that Bulgaria would receive the expected sums but under strictly specified conditions: the passage of an act on privatization, the amendment to the Land Act and the drafting of a programme on the first steps in privatization. These conditions will certainly be fulfilled, the prime minister believes.

The International Monetary Fund has not changed its stand on the stand-by arrangement with Bulgaria and even intends to proceed to an extended financial arrangement by the end of this year, Prime Minister Filip Dimitrov said. He explained that the IMF has set three, purely financial, conditions. They did not require any specific steps, only the government should meet its obligations. However, there was also an additional condition—the release of the second tranche of the World Bank's structural adjustment loan. And the World Bank will grant the second, U.S. dollars 100 million tranche after the passage of a privatization act and the start of the structural adjustment of the Bulgarian economy.

World Bank Official Cited on Loan Delay

AU1203131192 Vienna DIE PRESSE in German 11 Mar 92 p 13

[Veneta Jankova report: "World Bank Blocks Loans to Bulgaria"]

[Text] Sofia—Following an analysis of the reform processes in Bulgaria, experts of the IMF and the World Bank are giving sobering warning signals to the new democratic government. "It is better to wait with the loans than to permit their inefficient waste." With these words, World Bank representative John Wilson postponed for an indeterminate period the approval of the expected loan of $250 million, which was supposed to be allocated for the restructuring of the economy.

High Time for Privatization Process

Speaking to journalists, the experts of the international financial institutes stressed that Bulgaria is the only country of the former East Bloc that has not yet established any legal basis for the privatization of the economy and is considerably lagging behind with its reforms.

Therefore, Wilson fears that it will be difficult to convince the international economic institutions that Bulgaria is opening a new chapter in economic reforms.

"It is high time to start the privatization process and not to deal with other questions," the expert recommended. Concern is also caused by the fact that despite the efforts to implement agricultural reform, no one has yet been given ownership of land.

The financial experts of the IMF and the World Bank formulated clear preconditions for the granting of the second tranche of World Bank loan for structural reform: a law on privatization; a working agricultural reform that will show results in autumn; as well as a reform of the banking sector; and legislation involving social safeguards for the weakest members of society.

For the time being, Bulgaria will also not be able to conclude the three-year contract with the IMF that would give the country access to 400 percent of the quota it has contributed to the fund. Without structural reforms and a positive statement by the World Bank a second stand-by loan will also be problematical.

BSP Insists Demonstrations 'Peaceful'

AU1203214492 Sofia BTA in English
2121 GMT 12 Mar 92

[Text] Sofia, March 12 (BTA)—Mr. Zhan Videnov, leader of the Bulgarian Socialist Party (BSP), went on the national television tonight to read a declaration by the BSP Supreme Council. The attempts to describe today's pensioners' rallies demanding pension adjustment as a threat to the national security are demagogic attempts to cover up or shift to someone else the real problems of our society, it was said in the declaration.

People's natural protests do not endanger national security and we will not let ourselves be provoked, Mr. Videnov said. He called BSP supporters to peaceful rallies on March 14 and 21, the first in defense of the property of the "DUMA" Publishing House and the other under the motto "Jobs, bread, democracy."

The declaration came in response to a statement by the Press Center of the Ministry of the Interior two days ago warning against possible organized protests held as rallies of socially disadvantaged and sick people.

Pensioners Hold Countrywide Protest Rallies

AU1203194392 Sofia BTA in English
1804 GMT 12 Mar 92

[Report by Ani Parmaksuzyan]

[Text] Sofia, March 12 (BTA)—Pensioners held a rally in Sofia today to demand an adjustment of pensions. The rally was organized by the National Council for Social Defense of Pensioners, the city leaderships of the Union of the Disabled, the Union of Patriotic War Veterans, the Union of Officers and NCO'S in the reserve, the Bulgarian Antifascist Union and the Women for Democracy Movement. March 12 was declared a day of social defence of pensioners and has been marked by "peaceful civilized actions, across Bulgaria," according to speakers at the rally. The square in front of the Aleksandur Nevski Cathedral near the building of parliament was crowded with participants in the rally.

The rally sent a petition to President Zhelyu Zhelev, parliament and the government insisting on an additional allowance for disabled, socially disadvantaged and sick people and on a rise in pensions with every rise in the average wages.

Bulgaria has 2,400,000 pensioners. 67 per cent of them get a monthly pension of up to 465 leva (about 20 us dollars), 25 per cent up to 600 leva, 8 per cent up to 765 leva and only 4,000 pensioners get up to 815 leva, according to Mr. Todor Kolev of the Pensioners' Union.

The payment of compensations to pensions was discontinued last August. In February parliament decided to pay each pensioner 200 leva in a one-time benefit. Pensioners held a rally in Sofia on January 8 a few days before the first round of the first direct presidential elections.

Today's rally did not provoke clashes. Two days ago the Ministry of the Interior made a declaration warning about possible conflicts during the mass protest actions in Sofia.

The World Bank's condition for the release of $ U.S. 100 million - the second tranche of the structural adjustment loan - is that the number of people who retire on a pension early should be reduced. This condition also includes the drafting of a programme for the adjustment of pensions and social benefits, as well as clearing a social security bill with the World Bank.

"The pension security bill is almost ready. We will present it to the World Bank before it is introduced in parliament," Deputy Minister of Labor and Social Affairs Dukhomir Minev told the "ZEMYA" newspaper today.

Rallies were also held in Plovdiv, Blagoevgrad, Turgovishte, Ruse, Sliven, Pleven, Pernik, and other towns.

Bessarabian, Tauric Bulgarians Want To Return

AU1203173292 Sofia BTA in English
1653 GMT 12 Mar 92

[Text] Ruse, March 12 (BTA)—"We are not paupers, crooks or idlers. We only want to buy land, to return to our motherland and work," Ivan Dundarov, chairman of the Union of Bessarabian and Tauric Bulgarians, told a news conference in Ruse today. The time is ripe for our fellow-countrymen's return and this important question should be settled by the government. "Besides, the disintegration of the Soviet Union gave us a chance we should not miss," Mr. Dundarov added.

He reminded the press that most of the 700,000 Bulgarians in the former Soviet Republics maintain contacts with their relatives in Bulgaria. They would come back if they are given land and a livelihood, he said. Some ten days ago a request for 150,000 ha [hectares] of state and municipal land was forwarded to the National Assembly chairman. This land belonged to the ancestors of the Bessarabian and Tauric Bulgarians.

The Ministry of Agriculture granted the patriotic request in principle, especially as far as some regions are concerned. The union is still waiting for a reply by the Council of Ministers and parliament.

Observers believe these Bulgarians' return may become a decisive factor in the revival of Bulgarian farming ruined by the communist regime.

Czech, Slovak Prime Ministers Discuss 'Barriers'

LD1203181992 Prague Federal 1 Television Network in Czech 2130 GMT 11 Mar 92

[Excerpts] In Prague, Slovak Premier Jan Carnogursky and Deputy Premier Martin Porubjak met with Czech Premier Petr Pithart for a 100-minute meeting that was attended also by Jiri Dienstbier, deputy premier of the Federal Government. [passage omitted]

Czech-Slovak relations were also discussed. Politicians' optimism in assessing the results of talks is amazing—our public as well as journalists hold a more skeptical view of talks on a model of our two nations' coexistence which has gone on for over a year now.

On the Czech side, the Civic Democratic Alliance voiced a view a few days ago pointing out that the talks should have certain limits which are not to be overstepped.

[Begin recording] [Unidentified correspondent] This stance seems to reflect a view that there are certain barriers reached by the Czech side and these barriers seem to be the final ones. Is the Slovak Government aware of this?

[Carnogursky, in Slovak] [passage omitted] The Milovy talks ended as they ended and it seems that a certain chapter was concluded. Nevertheless, this chapter was not concluded by that step, by that action, providing there is will shown by both sides to continue—we simply have to find a sort of a modus vivendi for ourselves. That process can last long but only providing there is will shown by both sides that the process is not going to stop. [passage omitted]

[Correspondent] Mr. Premier, do you think that there really are no barriers, no limits regarding how far it is possible to go in constitutional talks?

[Pithart] There are obstacles, there are barriers here but none of them is the final one as is proved by this meeting. We confirmed that, at least as far as we are concerned, we are not going to initiate any unconstitutional steps. On the contrary, we are going to do everything to prevent them from talking place. My firm conviction is that we are going to be successful in this, at least during the period up to the election. [passage omitted]

My conviction is that as we seem to have reached the bottom, perhaps beginning now there is going to be more will shown by both sides to climb up again and look for other, new possibilities. [passage omitted] [end recording]

Carnogursky: Bratislava Rally Has No Significance

AU1303121392 Prague CSTK in English 2106 GMT 11 Mar 92

[Text] Prague March 11 (CSTK)—Slovak Premier Jan Carnogursky said today he does not consider Saturday's [14 March] planned celebrations of the 53d anniversary of the wartime independent Slovak state to have any political significance.

He was speaking to journalists here after meeting with Czech Premier Petr Pithart, Czechoslovak Foreign Minister Jiri Dienstbier and Slovak Deputy Premier Martin Porubjak.

Carnogursky said none of the influential political parties in Slovakia will take part in the celebrations.

Reaction to Slovak Anniversary Plans Reported

LD1203234692 Prague CSTK in English 2027 GMT 12 Mar 92

[Text] Bratislava March 12 (CSTK)—Slovak extraparliamentary national-orientated political parties are preparing a rally in Bratislava March 14 to mark the 53rd anniversary of the declaration of the pro-fascist Slovak state, which a majority of Slovak parliamentary parties reject.

The Slovak state was declared March 14, 1939 under German pressure and existed until the end of World War II in 1945.

The Civic Democratic Union-Public Against Violence (ODU-VPN), the winner in the 1990 parliamentary elections in Slovakia and a government coalition member, characterises the foundation of the state as "being a rather unfortunate way of saving the Slovak nation from the horrors of (the Second World) War", but criticises the functioning of the state which was "unquestionably a fascist state".

The other government coalition member - the Democratic Party (DS) - says that the "March 14 celebrations ... cause suspicion abroad that the nation is not frank with democracy". The DS has called on its members, and the whole nation to dissociate themselves from the celebrations.

The Hungarian Civic Party (MOS), the third government coalition member, also holds a negative stand towards the Slovak state and its president Jozef Tiso.

The chairman of the Christian Democratic Movement (KDH), the strongest coalition member, Jan Carnogursky says that "present efforts in Slovakia at promoting its (international) standing stem from Slovakia's needs, from international law which guarantees nations the right to self-determination as well as from Czechoslovakia's constitutional status quo, but in no way do they follow up the 1939-1945 Slovak state". According to Carnogursky, any attempts at continuing the Slovak state traditions are "naive, and harmful to the present Slovak political efforts".

Slovakia's strongest opposition "Movement for a Democratic Slovakia" (HZDS) will not mark the anniversary.

According to the Democratic Left Party (SDL, former communists), "it is a misfortune for the idea of Slovakia's statehood, if it is linked with March 14 and with the state which existed (in Slovakia) in 1939-1945".

The strongest nationalist-orientated party in the Slovak parliament - the Slovak National Party (SNS) - recognises the whole Slovak history. In its opinion, the foundation of the Slovak state in 1939 was one of the stages of the Slovak nation's emancipation efforts, which cannot be taken out of the context of Europe at that time. The SNS rejects the black-and-white view and an a priori condemnation of Slovak statehood of 1939-45.

The Czech Freedom Fighters Union (CSBS) today condemned the celebrations of the 53rd anniversary of the foundation of the Slovak state which are being prepared by the Slovak National Unity Party, said a CSBS statement presented to CSTK today. The CSBS considers the existence of the Slovak Republic, together with the occupation of the Czech lands (by Nazi Germany) the darkest period in Czechoslovak history, the statement said.

Slovak politicians of the Tiso regime expelled 9,000 Czech families from Slovakia and deported 58,000 Jews to concentration camps, the statement recalled.

Bratislava Mayor Refuses To Ban 14 Mar Rally

LD1203201492 Prague Stanice Ceskoslovensko Radio Network in Czech 0800 GMT 12 Mar 92

[Text] Many Bratislava citizens have demanded that Mayor Peter Kresanek act in accordance with the law and forestall the promotion of fascism by preventing the rally planned for 14 March.

In a statement to the Czechoslovak News Agency, the mayor of Bratislava said, among other things, that the organizers of the rally are within the requirements of the law. The local authorities may disperse the rally only if a criminal offense is committed. The mayor believes that the organizers will be able to control the rally, and that no ill effects will result.

Slovak Independence Demonstration Draws 700

LD1203225192 Prague CSTK in English 2120 GMT 12 Mar 92

[Text] Bratislava March 12 (CSTK)—About 700 people demonstrated here today in support of an independent Slovakia at a meeting organised by the Movement for the Liberation of Slovakia (HZOS).

HZOS chairman Frantisek Kollar said the HZOS is not calling for an independent state similar to the wartime Slovak state, but one based on the principles of democracy, plurality and freedom.

Other speeches at the meeting contained invectives against Czechoslovak President Vaclav Havel, Jews, and "Czech liberalism". The speakers called for a speedy establishment of an independent state which would be democratic, Christian, humane and socially just. A Czechoslovak flag was burnt at the end of the peaceful rally.

Dubcek Cited on Federal State, 14 Mar Rally

LD1203233592 Prague CSTK in English 2116 GMT 12 Mar 92

[Text] Bratislava March 12 (CSTK)—Czechoslovak federal parliament Chairman Alexandr Dubcek today said the solution to working out Czechoslovakia's future state setup also lies in the hands of Czech politicians, though he said it is presented to be only as a matter of Slovak representatives.

In an interview with CSTK, Dubcek responded to last week's statement by Czech parliament Vice-Chairman Jan Kalvoda that Czech and Slovak representatives no longer have anything to discuss.

Dubcek said that despite the federal parliament's failure to approve a draft of the three sections of the future constitution, the opinion of some Czech politicians that there is nothing to discuss cannot be accepted. "Let us respect what is usual in Western democracies—let the matter be settled by political forces that will emerge from the elections in three months' time", Dubcek said.

Referring to the planned celebrations of the 53rd anniversary of the foundation of the wartime independent Slovak state by some nationalist groups in Slovakia, Dubcek said its existence was a tragic chapter in Slovak and Czechoslovak history. The Slovak nation rehabilitated itself through its uprising in 1944, which was a struggle for national liberation and for the restoration of Czechoslovak statehood, Dubcek said.

He added the planned celebrations harm the good name of the Slovak nation which seeks to occupy a dignified position among advanced nations.

In a separate statement to CSTK Dubcek said he is leaning towards membership in the Slovak Social Democratic Party (SDSS) but, he added, he has not yet made a decision.

Slovak 'Initiatives' Urge Sovereignty Declaration

AU1203190392 Prague CSTK in English 2006 GMT 9 Mar 92

[Text] Bratislava March 9 (CSTK)— Representatives of four Slovak civic initiatives favoring Slovakia's sovereignty today told reporters that the Slovaks are the last nation in Europe that has not yet declared its sovereignty.

The representatives said at their first joint news conference that adoption of a declaration on Slovakia's sovereignty and of a constitution of sovereign Slovakia are necessary prerequisites for transformation of the Slovak economy and settlement of the present intolerable political, economic, and mainly social situation in Slovakia.

A representative of the Independent Association of Slovak Economists, Milos Plachtinsky, said a market economy is inevitable, but specific features of the Slovak economy must be taken into consideration. Economic

reform which applies to the whole of Czechoslovakia is not suitable for Slovakia, he said.

[Bratislava PRAVDA in Slovak on 10 March on page 3 carries a 100-word CSTK report on the above news conference, which identifies the four "civic initiatives" as the Independent Association of Slovak Economists (NEZES), Sixty-One Steps Toward Slovak Identity- Sovereign Slovakia, the Society of Slovak Intelligentsia-Roots, and the Stur Society]

Czech 'Concern' About Ties With Slovaks Noted

AU1303104292 Prague HOSPODARSKE NOVINY in Czech 10 Mar 92 p 2

[CSTK report: "The Czech Republic Government Presidium Is Concerned"]

[Text] At its meeting yesterday the Czech Republic Government Presidium expressed its concern about the development of Czech-Slovak relations in the last few days. However, it assures the citizens of the Czech Republic that the Czech Republic Government is fully prepared to promptly react to any situations that might arise as a result of a threat to the common state by non-constitutional steps.

According to information provided by Czech Government Spokesman Vladimir Zelezny, in this connection the Presidium also noted that the Czech Republic Government continues to endorse the principles of the common state based on democratic foundations.

The Czech Republic Government Presidium also considered the problems of press distribution. It acknowledged the conclusion of the agreement among the Union of Publishers of the Daily Press, the Post and Telecommunications Administration, the Czech Postal Service, and the Postal Newspaper Subscription Service [PNS]. It called on the relevant ministers to submit the PNS privatization project to the Committee of the Czech Republic Government's Economic Council at the earliest possible date.

Havel 'Afraid' of Presidential Election Problems

AU1203084292 Prague MLADA FRONTA DNES in Czech 10 Mar 92 p 2

["(zj, pch)"-signed report: "Parliament Will Answer the Question"]

[Text] President Vaclav Havel stated yesterday that the non-adoption of three chapters of the constitution presents a very grave situation. Federal Assembly First Deputy Chairman Zdenek Jicinsky declared, on the contrary, that the subsequent preservation of the constitution in its current form would not necessarily—in connection with the possible non-election of a president—lead to a constitutional crisis.

However, the currently valid constitution does not take into consideration the fact that a president does not have to be elected by the Federal Assembly. Following the most recent session of parliament's Political Board, Deputy Kroupa declared tersely: A single party would have to win the elections, and then the president would, obviously, have a chance.

Vaclav Havel noted yesterday that the new president must be elected in the period between 21 June and 5 July 1992: "That is, shortly after the new Federal Assembly holds its first session. This will probably be at a time when the new Federal Government has still not been formed. The president has to be elected in a secret ballot by a three-fifths majority in all three parts of the federal parliament. I am afraid that Jesus Christ combined with Winston Churchill would not be elected president in such an election.... It is possible to envisage that we will have neither a president nor a new government and, moreover, a non-functioning parliament."

Therefore, according to Zdenek Jicinsky, the April session of parliament should amend the stipulations on electing a president. Of the non-adopted three chapters of the constitution, Zdenek Jicinsky proposes using—at least—the following method for electing the president: Within 14 days after the unsuccessful election of a head of state, the election should be reheld. The candidate who received a more than 50 percent majority of votes cast by the deputies present, would be declared the winner. If none of the candidates won the required number of votes in the second round, a third round would be held. The two most successful candidates from the second round would advance into this round. Whoever won most votes in all parts of parliament would be elected president.

Those deputies who did not approve the amendment to three chapters of the constitution will primarily decide whether this proposal will be adopted. Let us remember that in the Slovak part of the Chamber of Nations they were deputies from the Party of the Democratic Left, the Movement for a Democratic Slovakia, and the Slovak National Party.

However, as opposed to the president, Zdenek Jicinsky points out that, according to the currently valid constitution, the non-election of a head of state would not have to provoke a constitutional crisis. The applicable article of the law on the Czechoslovak Federation states, among other things, that the execution of presidential duties will cede to the CSFR Government if the office of president is vacant and a new president has not yet been elected, has not taken the oath of office, or cannot execute his duties for serious reasons. While the government is executing the duties of president, the Federal Assembly Presidium is responsible for appointing and recalling the government and its members and for charging them with overseeing the ministries and other federal central organs.

'Late Receipt' Delays FRG Treaty Ratification

AU1303094992 Prague LIDOVE NOVINY in Czech 10 Mar 92 p 1

["jik"-signed report: "Federal Assembly: Change of Program; Treaty in April"]

[Text] Prague— After the 6 March meeting of the Federal Assembly's Political Board, one principal point was dropped from the planned agenda of the second part of the 21st joint meeting of the Federal Assembly chambers—the proposal that the Federal Assembly express its approval of the treaty between the CSFR and the FRG. We asked Zdenek Jicinsky, first deputy chairman of the Federal Assembly (Civic Movement - independent), about the reasons for dropping the treaty from the agenda.

"We have dropped the treaty from the agenda because we received the government bill only in the course of the 6 March meeting. The Federal Assembly is under an obligation to send the bill to the national councils for them to deliver their opinion on the treaty and they have two weeks' time to communicate their standpoint to us," Zdenek Jicinsky said. "In view of the late receipt of the bill from the government, the treaty will most probably appear on the agenda of the April session of the Federal Assembly."

Deputy Minister on Trade Prospects With Ukraine

LD1203211492 Prague Stanice Ceskoslovensko Radio Network in Czech 1100 GMT 12 Mar 92

[Interview with Lubomir Martak, federal deputy foreign trade minister, by correspondent Jaroslav Skalicky; place and date not given; —recorded; Martak speaks in Slovak]

[Excerpts] The Ukrainian share of our trade with the former Soviet Union, which last year reached approximately 160 billion korunas, was about 14 percent. This year trade relations with the now independent republic follow the so-called annual protocol. Jaroslav Skalicky speaks with Lubomir Martak, deputy Federal foreign trade minister, about mutual trade prospects.

[Skalicky] I have no doubt that Ukraine is interested in Czechoslovak products which, by the way, have a long tradition here.

[Martak] That is very true. Ukraine is interested not only in products, it is very close to Czechoslovakia, it likes our model of transformation of the economy. So we were well received, were the focus of a lot of interest. This, of course, was reflected in the annual protocol on the exchange of goods that I signed a couple of days ago. Ukraine is interested in our goods worth almost $470 million, especially engineering products, from streetcars, buses, and trolleys to consumer goods and also basic engineering products, chemicals, and others. They are offering roughly $250 million worth of goods from their own list, which unfortunately, unlike Russia, are not raw materials and it is difficult to find a place for them on the Czechoslovak market. So if we achieve 200 million worth of export-import on each side, it will be a very good result of trade with Ukraine in 1992. [passage omitted]

[Skalicky] Czechoslovakia is taking part in the integration venture in Krivoy Rog, the construction of an ore-processing plant. Many doubts have been raised in this context.

[Martak] The Ukrainians do want to solve that problem. In about half a year's time they will try to bring that part which is under construction up to some good international standard but my feeling is that the Ukrainian side is not really interested in the completion of the integrated plant.

[Skalicky] What will be the consequences for those Czechoslovak companies that are taking part in the venture?

[Martak] I think this is a very difficult situation. We already know that the Ministry of Finance has suspended the funding of this construction. [passage omitted]

[Skalicky] This has a link to the next question. Russia inherited the international commitments of the former Soviet Union. Does this mean that it will also take Ukrainian debts upon itself? In other words, does Ukraine have any financial commitments toward Czechoslovakia at this time?

[Martak] That is a very difficult question since it concerns the internal relations between Russia and Ukraine. They have internally divided the debt in such a way that about 16 percent of the debt falls to Ukraine but today Ukraine, after experience with Russia, claims that it wants to solve the problem of its indebtedness on its own and that it does not want to abide by the rules previously agreed. At the same time however it is requesting a postponement of the finalization of this matter because things are not clear and the country does not have an agreement with the Russian Federation. So, only after the solution of this problem is Ukraine willing, and has promised, to pay its debts. We have tried to present our claims and even achieve some written form of an agreement but the Ukrainian side did not want to accept that for the time being.

So as far as former Soviet debts to us are concerned, we will present our claims to the Russian Federation.

Government Approves Soviet Troop, Radio Bills

LD1303091392 Prague CSTK in English 0742 GMT 13 Mar 92

[Text] Prague March 13 (CSTK)—At its session on Thursday, the Czechoslovak Government approved a bill on consumer taxes to be imposed on some kinds of fuels, spirits, beer, wine and tobacco as a new taxation takes effect January 1, 1993. Another bill provides for physical persons paying social, medical and employment insurance totalling 14 per cent by which the tax base will be reduced. The government also approved a bill on

re-establishing commodity exchanges as an important element of market economy.

The government agreed to initialling a draft agreement between the Czechoslovak and Russian Federation on settlement of property and financial issues linked to the stay of Soviet troops in Czechoslovakia in the years 1968-1991.

The government agreed to contribute 300 million crowns (10 million USD) to funding the construction of flats for members of the former Soviet Army in Russia.

The government approved bills on Prague-based Czechoslovak radio and Czechoslovak television, which become legal persons managing their own property.

Goncz: Relations With Romania 'Priority' Issue

AU1203151492 Bucharest CURIERUL NATIONAL in Romanian 6 Mar 92 pp 1,4

[Part two of interview with Hungary's President Arpad Goncz, by Eugen Preda, special correspondent of Romanian television, in Budapest on 26 February: "Hungarian-Romanian Relations Among Priorities of Hungarian Foreign Policy"]

[Text] [Preda] Mr. President, there is a saying that one cannot choose one's parents and neighbors. How do you view the future development of Hungarian-Romanian relations?

[Goncz] Proceeding from the previous stage in our relations, I believe I must include Hungarian-Romanian relations among the priority goals of the Hungarian foreign policy. Considering that we do not choose our neighbors—having no other choice—we have to live in peace with them. The circumstance of living side by side with our neighbors throughout the centuries has led to the establishment of a similarity in culture and thinking and it has created basic conditions for friendship and mutual understanding. There are Romanians living in Hungary and Hungarians living in Romania. In the spirit of good traditions, from the point of view of their culture and language, we consider the Romanians living in Hungary as part of the Romanian nation, and they have the right to use their language, to set up organizations, to preserve their ethnic identity, and pursue their links with the mother country. That is why they have a right to positive discrimination. We believe that the same thing is natural for Hungarians living in the countries bordering our country, or for those who live in other places, because this is an inseparable part of human rights. The culture of Hungarians and Romanians who live together in Transylvania has had a mutual influence on people throughout the centuries; this cannot be erased from their souls. Every Romanian in Hungary and every Hungarian in Romania carries within himself Romanian and Hungarian cultural values, and these values are virtually inseparable. On the other hand, from this derives the fact that the two ethnic groups within and outside the borders can help very, very much in the rapprochement of the two countries. Central Europe and East Europe proper, that is, all of Eastern Europe, is a mosaic of nations. The borders of countries have divided nations in two and placed them far away from each other. That is why they do not live in a homogeneous mass. The dismantling of the old socialist system as a result of the tension that was created helped us realize to what extent our world is or is not homogeneous or united. However, there is not only tension hiding within this colorful phenomenon, but first and foremost values. We should realize this because the tragedy starts when we do not consider differences and that "something different" as values but rather as a source of danger, whereas this "something different" is above all else a value. I have very great confidence in the fact that in the new Europe—I wholeheartedly hope so—that will integrate not only Hungary, but Romania too, permeable borders will create the practical possibility to maintain the identity of ethnic minorities and will turn them into a bridge. However, thanks to suspicions and the stereotypes that have been ingrained for centuries, there is always the danger that one of the ethnic minorities in one of our countries or in both will play the role of pawn on the chess board of domestic policy. This is a great temptation in domestic policy and somehow it should be resisted.

[Preda] Mr. President, you have given an outline of a very large range of issues; could you please tell us what steps you have in mind in order to improve relations between the two countries?

[Goncz] In our case, I believe that the first thing to do would be—something that to a greater or lesser extent is already finalized—to endorse the law on ethnic minorities, and implement it in letter and spirit. Another permanent task for us would be never to cut ourselves off from the real processes and the social reality. The social reality is that for centuries on end people have been living together peacefully. We must preserve this peace like a treasure, jealously and desperately.

[Preda] Thank you very much

[Goncz] I thank you, too.

Defense Minister's Adviser Views Security Policy

AU1203090892 Budapest MAGYAR HIRLAP in Hungarian 10 Mar 92 p 8

[Interview with Laszlo Tolnay, chairman of the defense minister's advisory body, by Kalman Aniszi; place and date not given: "The Time of the Deterrent Is Gone"]

[Excerpt] [passage omitted]

[Aniszi] As for our "trust" in weapons, can we feel secure?

[Tolnay] In the issue of security, rather than starting by comparing its military potential to that of the neighboring countries, the Hungarian Army uses security policy measures to endeavor to establish an environment that is favorable and reassuring for Hungary. This notion is expanded here because, according to this logic, rather than trying to guarantee security through threatening with brute force, it is done through non-military security policy steps and measures.

[Aniszi] The true basis of peace is fairness and justice. Increasingly often, we can hear that the borders that were drawn in Europe after World War II are unjust. Nevertheless, they have to be respected. Is this due to anxiety about the possible consequences or to the fact that, today, moving the borders is no longer the goal but something else in its place, for example opening them?

[Tolnay] We can establish that, after World War II, a situation emerged in East-Central Europe where the map was drawn according to the peace treaties following the war. Since then, these borders have been supported by a number of international statutes. Such statutes are, for example, the U.N. Charter, the Helsinki Final Act, and

various bilateral agreements that prescribe the inviolability of borders—not that they cannot be changed but that they cannot be violated. The difference is that, while inviolability also presumes violent steps to change the borders, the possibility to change them means that borders can only be altered as a result of negotiations and agreement between the sides.

We signed the U.N. Charter and the Helsinki Final Act, and we have quite a few agreements that basically settle our relations with other European, mainly neighboring, countries, and now we are in the process of signing new basic agreements. These are the guiding factors from this point of view, and not the ones that were laid down in the peace treaties after the first or the second world war. Therefore, in my view, it is not on the basis of the peace treaties that the issue of the inviolability of borders has to be examined, but on the basis of the obligations laid down in international agreements and documents also signed by us.

[Aniszi] The decades-long opposition of the superpowers—the Soviet Union and the United States of America—has ceased, the conditions for reducing the military forces have improved, and the chances of reducing armaments are better. The question, however, is whether the Commonwealth of Independent States, formed in place of the Soviet Union, will be a long-lasting or only a temporary phenomenon, and whether we will again need to be afraid of superpower attempts, for example, from the Russian side. What effects could it have on Hungary if the local flare-ups in various places become extended?

[Tolnay] For the time being, it is hard to give a clear answer to this question. We cannot say yet what situation will arise in the former Soviet Union as a result of internal processes and movements, and the relationship of the successor states. This is still in the process of settlement, therefore, I do not believe anyone would dare to assess it. Whether this transitional period is dangerous for us depends on the way these countries can make agreements with each other and whether they will be able to create a stable situation. In my view, the biggest danger for us is the fact that these countries are unstable from a political, economic, and military point of view. The relations that will have to characterize them in the future have not yet been formed. However, in addition to these countries' being recognized, they are being included in international organizations, they have joined the United Nations, and they are joining the North Atlantic Cooperation Council (a joint organization of NATO and former Warsaw Pact countries, whose forthcoming foreign ministerial session includes the admission of the Soviet successor states—MAGYAR HIRLAP editor's note). Their future activities in this organization will provide an opportunity for coordination that may drive events in a reassuring direction.

[Aniszi] Is it correct that, according to this, the chances of the countries' resolving their disputes through negotiations instead of through the use of armaments will improve? Is it better to prevent crises than to handle them?

[Tolnay] Yes. I would like to clear up another matter, though. In the past, we thought that the two big world systems and military alliances may even face each other in a big war. Fortunately, the chances of this have decreased, especially in Europe. However, some other problems have come to the forefront that might even be dangerous for us. The possible surfacing of conflicts between the successor states could lead to a war and this is a real source of danger.

To return to the basic question, we definitely have to strive in every way to establish, through political and diplomatic measures, a situation which precludes the use of weapons and strengthens the chances of peace. The road to peace is not through deterrents represented by weapons but through the solution of disputes with diplomatic means and using guarantees that are mainly based on agreements.

Donations Arrive To Fund Moscow TV Broadcasts

LD1003104892 Budapest MTI in English 0900 GMT 10 Mar 92

[Text] Budapest, March 10 [MTI]—The Hungarian Russian Sciences Institute has begun a collection action to restart the broadcasting of Moscow TV's programmes in Hungary. Many donations have already arrived in the wake of the appeal, said Gyula Szvak, director of the institute, in an interview with the daily "MAGYAR HIRLAP".

As reported, programmes of Moscow television went off the air in Hungary from March 5. Tamas Katona, political secretary of state of the foreign ministry, said in an interview with Friday's "NEPSZABADSAG" that the decision was an economic, rather than a political one: Neither Hungarian television or the Foreign Ministry accepted to cover the annual one million forint cost of transmitting the programmes. According to Katona, the programmes were broadcast mainly in view of the Soviet citizens who lived and worked in Hungary.

On the other hand, Gyula Szvak points out the programmes were watched not only by the Soviets in Hungary, or the ice-hockey fans, but all those who were interested in the current events in Russia, or who enjoyed Soviet culture. The Director of the Russian Sciences Institute said they have informed Elemer Hankiss, the president of Hungarian television, that they would accept to cover the costs of the broadcast. Szvak added it was strange that an institution operating with a more than 1 billion forint budget does not have sufficient funds to this end.

Center Accord Faces Internal Tension

AU1103143092 Warsaw PAP in English 1958 GMT 8 Mar 92

[Text] Warsaw, March 8—Some 140 activists of the Centre Alliance (PC) met here Sunday and demanded an urgent meeting of the political council of the party. Today's meeting, attended by 7 PC MP's, was later described by PC leader Jaroslaw Kaczynski, who had not been present, as "aimed at splitting the party and paralysing the party leadership." Kaczynski said he expected disciplining measures would be taken against the 7 MP's who participated in the session in violation of an earlier resolution of the PC parliamentary caucus.

The session, held behind closed doors, issued a statement in which the participants, members of the so-called Christian Democratic Faction within the party, voiced support for the government of Jan Olszewski and opposed what they called "actions which destabilize the situation in Poland and undermine the government's position." They were referring to recent attempts by Jaroslaw and Lech Kaczynski to include the Democratic Union into the coalition backing the cabinet.

Kaczynski told reporters after the meeting today that he would continue efforts at including the Democratic Union in the coalition, which was in the best interests of Poland. He also criticised the government for not making sufficient effort to shore up its position in parliament. Kaczynski promised to hold a meeting of the political council early next month.

Splinter Group Criticized

LD1203032292 Warsaw PAP in English 2350 GMT 11 Mar 92

[Text] Warsaw, March 11—The Centre Alliance (PC) main board condemned the participation of its seven parliamentarians in the Sunday forum of Christian-Democratic thought that was later termed by PC leader Jaroslaw Kaczynski as an act aimed at "splitting the party and paralysing the party leadership."

A resolution adopted by the main board speaks of disciplinary measures to be taken against the seven. The board also expressed support for Kaczynski and his efforts to broaden the ruling coalition. The board failed to adopt a resolution of support for the Jan Olszewski cabinet. Its draft was forwarded by representatives of the forum, but the PC main board decided that the matter was rather controversial.

Prime Minister Jan Olszewski will meet Thursday with the PC parliamentary caucus. The Christian-Democrats in the PC hope that the meeting will help clarify the attitude of the party towards the Olszewski cabinet and alleviate the tension within the party. If the conflict persists, the case may be forwarded to the disciplinary court.

Call To Broaden Ruling Coalition

LD1203234992 Warsaw PAP in English 2223 GMT 12 Mar 92

[Text] Warsaw, March 12—Leader of the Centre Alliance (PC) Jaroslaw Kaczynski stated on Thursday there were good prospects to broaden the ruling coalition and suggested the Democratic Union (UD) was the party in question. Speaking after a meeting of Prime Minister Jan Olszewski with the PC parliamentary floor group, Kaczynski said they had been briefed on the premier's talks with UD leader Tadeusz Mazowiecki.

"There has been an opening which is still subject to negotiation within the coalition. We have wanted that from the start. For us it was the question of the future of this cabinet and the future of Polish democracy. We hope this new situation will develop in the right direction," Kaczynski stated.

Head of the government press office Zbigniew Rykowski said that a broadened coalition would have a programmatic character.

Earlier on Thursday the PC caucus confirmed in a resolution its will "to build a majority coalition founded on an economic and political consensus." The resolution also says that democratic parties which accept the economic programme of Planning Minister Jerzy Eysymontt should form a joint ruling bloc that would ensure political and economic stability.

Walesa Meets With Newspaper Representatives

LD1203220992 Warsaw Radio Warszawa Network in Polish 1525 GMT 12 Mar 92

[Remarks by President Lech Walesa at a meeting with representatives of newspaper editorial boards in Warsaw on 12 March—recorded]

[Text] I do not have tell this company what the situation in the country is, how many question marks there are on each subject, how many proposals and solutions on various subjects. And all of this nonetheless can mean that very many of us here and in society are dissatisfied. This all doesn't hold together. Upon attaining the office of president I said: I don't want to, but I have to. Of course, today, I still continue to repeat this slogan. I wish that you would understand me. I did not have and do not have any ambitions.

Poland has many troubles, but it also has many possibilities too. After all, it is you, in various ways, that shape politicians, political parties, parliament, and society. And that is why I wish to cast here an abstract idea, but that in my opinion is again the most accurate that Walesa suceeds in putting forward. The parties are divided, the government is weak, the president is thrashing around. It seems to me that there is a beautiful solution. That it is possible to link the (?session) here with the president, because it seems to me that there would result the most beautiful and the most logical

party; it could attract this society on various topics, arrange it, stabilize it. A presidential-journalistic party of reforms in Poland. [muted laughter and applause]

And of course, this is a fantastic idea, but think if there were a great understanding about the past, about a sense of bringing to account, but above all, a great understanding on construction, political construction, economic construction. There is no force that could do this better than in the composition in which we find ourselves. It would be appropriate to select the subjects that we are implementing in ideas, political subjects, economic subjects, social problems, and the desire to resolve them. I am convinced, that in this company we are capable of selecting the subjects and putting them in order to a considerable extent. No one is in fact doing this. We have smashed one system and the construction of the second is frightfully difficult, because we have burdens and simultaneously do not have models. Where but here could we have an argument about something like this? I am casting a loose idea. Think it through. I would like, in a short while, to meet again in similar company and discuss whether this would indeed not have a greater sense, whether we would not be in a state fit to put Polish matters in order and simultaneously concern ourselves with the resolution of the most important ones, the ones that hurt the most.

One should not deliver monologues at this gathering, here one should hold a conversation on whether there is such a chance and such possibilities because I really see such possibilities. I see them and I know that this is the only force which could really move things forward far enough, sort things out far enough. There is no (?greater), wiser, or stronger force in Poland. Failing to take advantage of this strength and this opportunity will be discussed for a long time to come: They had such a great chance, they allowed themselves to be taken over by events, they spoke beside the point, they dealt with group interests, careerist topics, and failed to deal with significant issues.

Recently I put forward an idea concerning the Constitution, and look what I am reading about now. I know that the whole nation won't debate every point but I want to build a great debate, however as regards the approval of the constitution, I would like the whole nation to approve it and not just the president or the Sejm. As regards the nation, how we will get there technically speaking, which points must be answered by the whole nation? This is a matter of technique. I would like the whole nation to approve it so no important figure, no twists of fate can change our foundations.

Of course, a point can occur that will not stand the test of time, but why should this constitution not last for 200 or 500 years? And it will endure as long as nobody changes it according to their whims. We can attempt great solutions that will outlive us and the later generations, but they must be subject to the will of the nation. And the press writes: How shall we discuss the constitution? Gentlemen, is this some kind of joke?

We are making a joke of an important matter. Can't we live in this country without temporary arrangements? What we are doing most of the time is temporary—always being changed by someone else, corrected by someone. It is necessary to break away as regards the fundamental issues, it is necessary to make them fundamental so that they will last many years. That is why one must not negate the idea, one must improve it. I am not for improving and sorting out details. I am for big ideas, but please do not reject them outright. There are many such ideas. Take the 100 million idea, ladies and gentlemen, you can't imagine how much flak I get for it. And the idea was highly accurate because I wanted to give Poland to the Poles. I did not say that. I said that a poor society should be given equal opportunity, my idea was not to give Poland away, (?let nobody say that, that I wanted to give Poland away), to give it away to the West.

And so we do not receive any benefit from the great material possessions of the state. This must be given back, and the people will then find a solution. And return it in such a way that this, that this not be destroyed, only that building can occur. And this has been done. Today I hear that economists say after all that Poland is not worth that much. That depends on how we will be selling it, how we will be assessing it. If there were 100 willing people for this office building then it would be worth a billion, and if there weren't a willing taker then it would not be worth anything. If we put it up for auction, everyone will have money, then they will be (?higher), because everyone will want to take it. And so, well, it depends on the technique what the value will be, and from direct sale who will pay what. And so, I bid you farewell with this idea. If we had done this a year earlier, the state of the country would be different.

FSN Steering Collegium Meets With Iliescu

AU1303112392 Bucharest Radio Romania Network in Romanian 0500 GMT 13 Mar 92

[Text] We will now present the meeting of the Steering Collegium of the National Salvation Front [FSN], by resorting to our correspondent's reports and those of the written press, which is dealing exhaustively with this subject today.

The meeting began at 1420 with national leader Petre Roman's announcement about the reasons for calling it. One of these reasons was the request of President Ion Iliescu to hold talks with the members of the Steering Collegium in the presence of the FSN parliamentary groups, in order to find out what they think about positions concerning the political actions and events in the country taken by the leader of this majority party and by certain Executive Bureau members.

Yesterday's meeting was preceded by numerous meetings between Mr. Petre Roman and the parliamentary groups with President Iliescu.

Petre Roman requested that the participants should decide whether a meeting with President Iliescu was advantageous, bearing in mind that—according to the Constitution—the country's president holds a position outside the party. The vice president of the FSN's Organization Department said that President Ion Iliescu expressed his wish to speak with members of the Steering Collegium again at Cotroceni Palace, without the press being present. At the end of the first part of the meeting, the participants agreed to go and talk with the president, but in the presence of the press.

The agenda of the meeting was also passed. It contained an examination of the local election returns, the preparations made for the National Convention, and the position of the FSN with respect to the coming general and presidential elections.

The speakers, having all had the floor, passed the motion to invite President Iliescu but, at the same time, asked the press to leave the conference hall. Although a news conference had been announced for 2030, the only statement released for the press was the one made by Mr. Petre Roman at half an hour past midnight, local time.

The national leader of the FSN announced that the purpose of this meeting, according to what President Iliescu said, was to learn the opinion of the Steering Collegium members about the standpoints and statements of Mr. Roman, including his open letter to President Iliescu, his statements last September, and the interviews he recently gave to Romanian and foreign newspapers.

After 26 members of the Steering Collegium had taken the floor, President Iliescu's opinion was that he could not tell whether or not the members of the steering body agreed with Roman's statements.

Concerning the issue of the presidential candidacy, the FSN national leader said that the decision lies with Mr. Iliescu and that the National Convention—not the Steering Collegium—is the political body that makes formal nominations.

Petre Roman reasserted that the group he is leading is on its way to becoming a democratic party of reform and for reform, running in a democratic competition; consequently, it can no longer be called a broad movement addressing itself to the broad category of town and village workers.

Senator Solcanu Criticizes Roman

AU1203202792 Bucharest ROMPRES in English 2040 GMT 12 Mar 92

[Text] Bucharest ROMPRES, 12/3/1992—A meeting of the National Salvation Front [FSN] Steering Collegium was held in Bucharest on Thursday, March 12 which was also attended by national leader Petre Roman.

The agenda included talks on the results of the local elections; preparations for the National Convention of the National Salvation Front; the meeting to be held also on March 12 between the Steering Collegium and President Ion Iliescu.

During the debates on the results of local elections Mr. Petre Roman emphasised inter alia that "the fact that a part of the electorate cast its vote in favour of the Democratic Convention is a proof that people need a concrete change. People, Mr. Roman also said, want to put a definitive end to the communist whip and they want something in its place, and if such an offer does not come from the Front they will go to the right and the National Salvation Front will be pushed aside."

Senator Ion Solcanu, initiator of the Group for the Unity of the Front, underscored in his turn that the electorate's confusion caused by some statements made by Petre Roman about President Iliescu, by the attitude of daily AZI as well as by the lack of credibility of the National Salvation Front because it had started with a social democratic programme and acted as "a liberal government" were the main reasons leading to the negative results in local elections.

This evening the Steering Collegium of the National Salvation Front is to meet with President Ion Iliescu.

Press Views FSN 'Discontent'

AU1303133092 Bucharest ROMPRES in English 1138 GMT 13 Mar 92

[Text] Bucharest ROMPRES, 13/3/1992—"The Thursday of FSN's Discontent. Avantgardist Brawl or Just a Diversion?"—this is the heading of an article in daily ADEVARUL, covering the National Salvation Front [FSN] Steering Board's meeting of Thursday, 12 March, the agenda of which included three items: an analysis of the February local ballot, the strategy for the

upcoming general elections, and the vote-taking on a proposed meeting between the FSN Steering Board and the FSN parliamentary groups with President Iliescu, in consideration of President Iliescu's "important decision" he had to make, wherefore he wished to consult his former colleagues before. The whole dispute revolved around the place of the meeting, and its attendance or not by the parliamentary groups, says the newspaper. Since the FSN's executives could not decline a meeting with the head of state without impairing their reputation as people who cared about public interest, the meeting was suggested to be held at Dacia Hall, not at Cotroceni Palace, the newspaper notes. The implications were clear: If the President receives at the palace a group of politicians—as the Steering Board members are—this is normal political business. However, if the head of the state calls at the offices of a certain party, this is unprecedented action, which does not fit in the presidency's required equidistant position and somewhat supports the charges of unconstitutionality, which could be heard here and there.

The COTIDIANUL emphasizes the atmosphere in which the debates were held and which can be said to have been a Thursday of FSN discontent, to paraphrase some of the speakers' addresses. The same daily carries another article entitled "Who Hits Iliescu, Hits the FSN."

Under the headline "The FSN in the Sword Dance", REALITATEA ROMANEASCA refers to President Ion Iliescu as a FSN founder member and his concern over the inner struggle and the ripples made inside that political party which risks losing ground in the future elections. Showing the same respect for the mass media as until now, President Ion Iliescu asked the press to leave the room, the newspaper says. "The swords" were drawn by many speakers, "supporters" or "opponents" of the FSN national leader Petre Roman, as clarifications and bitter arguments were traded in a "sword dance" behind closed doors, followed by a news conference.

A commentary in CURIERUL NATIONAL, entitled "A Stormy FSN meeting Last Night" shows that "the history of how this meeting was called begins with President Ion Iliescu's request for a talk with the Steering Board to be attended by the FSN parliamentary groups, in order to know the latter's opinions on the positions voiced by the national leader of the majority political party and by members of its Steering Board on political acts and events in the country." The newspaper shows that FSN National Leader Petre Roman kept a neutral tone in his address until he referred to the unconstitutional character of the requests made by the President, a founder member of the FSN. No sooner was that said, than the atmosphere changed. "You have been talking for an hour and said nothing" a voice in the hall said.

The afternoon daily LIBERTATEA, which came off the press before the Steering Board started its session, ran an article under the title: "The Long Knives' Day for the FSN?"

DIMINEATA says in reference to the origins and significance of the FSN inner conflict, that "if we were to recall the first differences within the FSN, we would be somehow at a loss to do it, as they have always been there, one way or another. Now, when disputes don the coat of ideological clarifications, rather uncomfortable for those accustomed to just one ideology, or power at all costs, there are no few political analysts who try to reduce the FSN outburst to a so-called Iliescu-Roman conflict.

Nastase Comments on Brussels Meeting, Moldova

AU1203134192 Bucharest ROMPRES in English 1224 GMT 12 Mar 92

[Text] Bucharest ROMPRES 12/3/1992—The meeting in Brussels has been a very good opportunity for bilateral dialogues, stated Romanian Foreign Minister Adrian Nastase upon his return home after attending the meeting of the North Atlantic Cooperation Council. In spite of the very short time I had at my disposal I could talk with foreign ministers from many countries, like Gianni de Michelis. The general opinion I could grasp is a positive one, including the Romanian-U.S. relations.

Referring to the situation in the Republic of Moldova the Romanian foreign minister mentioned that that country's Foreign Minister Nicolae Tiu pointed to the risks for Moldova's security, for the security in the whole area. The bilateral talks evinced the risks for the emergence of hotbeds of tension in an area nearby Central Europe.

During my visit to Moscow I shall pay in a couple of days we shall certainly discuss, beside the questions we approached during Mr. Kozyrev's visit to Bucharest last year, matters related to the situation in Moldova, which is highly important owing to its implications, and I think it is both our duty and our Moscow partner's to approach it.

As for the possible presence of blue helmets in Transdniestria, the Romanian foreign minister assessed it was too early to discuss such a solution and other ways should necessarily be found before the situation could no longer be politically controlled.

Activities in Brussels

For reportage on Foreign Minister Adrian Nastase's activities in Brussels during the North Atlantic Council meeting see the International Affairs section of the West Europe DAILY REPORT for 11 March.

Ministry 'Pleased' With U.S. Election Assessment

AU1203174492 Bucharest Radio Romania Network in Romanian 1600 GMT 12 Mar 92

[Text] We are going to report on the statement of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, which was faxed to us this afternoon.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs was pleased to learn about the statement made on 11 March 1992 by the deputy spokesman of the State Department, according to which the United States welcomes the achievements of the Romanian people on their way toward a market economy and democratic pluralism and their progress in complying with criteria imposed by the CSCE and the international standards regarding organizing free and fair elections.

We also appreciate that the U.S. Administration decided to proceed with the signing of a new trade agreement with Romania. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs is certain that the signing and subsequent ratification of the new trade agreement between Romania and the United States—by which the clause of most favored nation status will mutually be reinstated—will give a significant impetus to the development of Romanian-U.S. relations.

Similarly, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs welcomes the 10 March 1992 statement of the European Community on the local elections in Romania, in which this organization and its member states acknowledged with satisfaction that the local elections in Romania were free and fair and reasserted their complete support for Romania on its way toward democracy.

These assessments made by the United States and the European Community—which can be added to other positive signals received lately from the United States and other West European countries—are an acknowledgement of the continuous efforts made by the Romanian people and government on their way toward reforms, the observance of human rights, and the consolidation of the state of legality, the statement of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs reads.

Moldovan Envoy Hopes for Political Settlement

AU1103154692 Bucharest ROMPRES in English 1255 GMT 11 Mar 92

[Text] Bucharest, ROMPRES 11/3/1992—"Those who proclaimed the so-called Dniestrian Republic want to take possession of a land which is not theirs," opines Aurel Danila, Bucharest ambassador of the Republic of Moldova, in an interview with daily DIMINEATA. He thinks they start "provocations so as to trigger a conflict through which Transdniestria—to their mind—might turn independent."

The ambassador of the Republic of Moldova assesses that "the situation in the zone is tenser now than ever because the Romanians on the left bank of the Dniester have, they too, started opposing the separatists," and a "real resistance movement" takes shape. The Romanians, A. Danila said, have realized that they cannot be subjugated through decrees issued by the Transdniestrian 'authorities'.

Stressing that "one can hardly say who backs the separatists," the ambassador believes that the conflict is not underlain by "economic reasons," sustaining that "an independent Transdniestria cannot get along economically." Their major purpose, Danila opines, is to get international recognition.

The ambassador also expressed his hope for a political settlement of the issue.

New Cooperation Treaty Signed With Germany

AU1203193292 Bucharest ROMPRES in English 1839 GMT 12 Mar 92

[Text] Bucharest ROMPRES, 12/3/1992—Thursday, March 12, at the headquarters of the Foreign Affairs Ministry of Germany, Ionel V. Sandulescu, secretary of state at the Romanian Foreign Ministry, and Helmut Schafer, minister of state at the German Foreign Ministry, initialed the treaty between Romania and Germany on friendly cooperation and partnership in Europe.

The significance of the moment was assessed by the two dignitaries as highly important, the initialed document laying a new legal basis to the links between the two states, a basis which will contribute to the development of the political and economic relations between Romania and Germany and to supporting Romania in fully integrating in the European structures.

Envoy Views Issues Nastase To Discuss in Moscow

AU1203195692 Bucharest ROMPRES in English 1841 GMT 12 Mar 92

[Text] Bucharest ROMPRES, 12/3/1992—The ambassador of the Russian Federation to Bucharest, Feliks Bogdanov, specified in a statement to a ROMPRES 'itor that the visit to Moscow on Friday, March 13, of Romanian Foreign Minister Adrian Nastase was a response visit with a marked working character, a natural continuation of the Russian-Romanian dialogue.

Highlighting that since the latest Russian-Romanian meeting, the international situation has undergone notable changes, Mr. Bogdanov stressed that this required a new legal framework for the bilateral relations. In his opinion it is possible that during Mr. Nastase's visit to Moscow, the new Russian-Romanian bilateral treaty be initialed, as it must be finalized in view of the forthcoming visit of President Yeltsin in Romania.

Referring to the working agenda of the two foreign ministers, Mr. Bogdanov mentioned inter alia the exchange of information on internal developments in the two countries, the survey of the state of bilateral relations, and an exchange of opinions on the legal framework necessary to promote economic ties. The Russian ambassador did not exclude the possibility that the Romanian side raise the question of Romania's Treasury, and the Russian side that of the legal regime of the

Black Sea continental shelf, the litigation over the Snakes Island being the object of direct Romanian-Ukrainian negotiations.

As for the developments in Transdniestria, which he thinks will also be examined in Moscow, the ambassador agreed with President Yeltsin's opinion, that the escalation of violence in this region risked to lead to the internationalization of the conflict, and assessed as necessary the finding of immediate solutions to defuse tension in Transdniestria. "As I understood, all the forces involved in the conflict want to find a negotiated solution, both the leadership of Moldova, of Romania, and of the Russian Federation and, as far as I known, that of Ukraine too."

CD Advocates Union With Bessarabia, Bukovina

AU1303095992 Bucharest ROMANIA LIBERA in Romania 10 Mar 92 p 1

[Appeal by the Democratic Convention; place and date not given: "Bessarabia and Bukovina Are Part of the Country"]

[Text] The Democratic Convention [CD] has discussed the decisions made in Chisinau by the Christian Democratic People's Front, as well as the recent events that have taken place in Moldova and believes that it is its duty to declare the following:

The Romanian territories on the other side of the Prut River—which are occupied by the USSR through force—represent an inalienable part of Romania, and its population is part and parcel of the Romanian nation. The bilateral denunciation of the Ribbentrop-Molotov Pact legally cancels the effects of this pact, and the issue of returning to the situation that existed before 1940 must be discussed at the negotiating table. Until then, neither as Romanians nor as Europeans can we remain indifferent to the acts of violence and terror directed against a civilian population by special troops that are in possession of modern equipment.

Thus, we call on the Parliament and the Government of Romania:

1. To officially declare that any attack against the integrity of persons and the territory of Moldova will be considered an attack against the territory and the citizens of Romania.

2. To reestablish, in accordance with the German precedent, the Romanian citizenship of the Romanians who live beyond the Prut River.

3. To immediately begin concrete political, economic, financial, and cultural actions with a view to reuniting the homeland.

We call on all citizens of our country to be together, in their hearts and thoughts, with our brothers from the other side of the Prut River. Bessarabia and Bukovina are part of the country.

[Signed] The Democratic Convention

Defense Minister Comments on Security Issues

AU1203135192 Bucharest ROMPRES in English 1004 GMT 12 Mar 92

[Text] Bucharest ROMPRES 12/3/1992—The concept of national security shouldn't be reduced to the capacity of military defence, the minister of national defence, Nicolae Spiroiu said in an interview with the daily "NATIUNEA," it must be understood as a complex of measures, comprising the fighting capacity of the Army. Mentioning that the Romanian Army brings its contribution to the favourable course of the creation of a new system of security in Europe, the minister of defence referred to a policy intended to ease conflicts. It has had taken no steps that could have worsened developments in Yugoslavia, has not fuelled interethnic conflicts.

As for the Ukraine, added Mr. Spiroiu, I think it significant that it was the ministries of defence of Romania and the Ukraine that had the first contact at a governmental level between the two countries. I refer to my 20 December interview with General Morozov, when we agreed that our armies collaborate in order to contribute to a climate of security in this part of the world. We have very good ties, on a military plane, with Hungary, to allow each party to know the other, to remove any source of suspicion, to ease all kinds of extremism on both sides, to make the military level a good example for the political one, mentioned Nicolae Spiroiu.

Speaking of the "Open Skies" Agreement, the minister of national defence showed that Romania and Hungary did nothing but offer an example of the way in which this document can be applied between two states, which need trust and transparency in their links. Fears that aerial surveys made on Romania can represent means of diminishing its capacity of defence and a danger for the national security are ungrounded, added Minister Nicolae Spiroiu. He opined that the positive example given by Romania and Hungary to the states interested in the "Open Skies" Agreement was much more important than the illusory protection one can think of in the absence of this agreement.

If there is any reason of concern, specified the defence minister, that is caused by unpredictable geopolitical or more precisely military-political evolutions in the geographical zone of Romania, and that is why we watch them closely, study them attentively and try, with more or less symbolic means, which our country can offer us, to make the Army prompt enough, to correspond to the missions the constitution vests it with. We have, fortunately, inner resources and an experience in passing through difficult moments in our history and that is important. And we are resourceful, and we have almost always relied on that. In fact, Romania is the only country in the former Warsaw Treaty, with the exception of the former Soviet Union, which has manufactured almost all the weapons and the technique to endow its Army at home, said the Romanian minister of defence.

International

UN Envoy Vance Satisfied With Visit

LD1303032192 Belgrade TANJUG in English 0024 13 Mar 92

[Text] United Nations, March 12 (TANJUG)—U.N. secretary-general special envoy Cyrus Vance said he was satisfied with his latest visit to Yugoslavia, assessing that matters are proceeding in such a way as to lead to a rapid establishment of the full composition of the UNPROFOR peacekeeping forces.

Cyrus Vance told TANJUG correspondent at the United Nations that he was particularly satisfied with the way in which commander of the peace forces General Nambiar was received and with the conduct of the hosts, the Yugoslav sides towards him. Vance has just arrived from a sixth visit to Yugoslavia, since he received a mandate from the U.N. secretary-general. During his visit he had talks with the presidents of Serbia, Croatia and Bosnia-Hercegovina and then attended a meeting of the European Community (E.C.) in Brussels devoted to the Yugoslav crisis.

Vance told TANJUG correspondent that in a special memorandum to the U.N. secretary-general he set out his observations in which he confirms the assessment that everything is ready for the receiving of the U.N. peace-keepers. The situation in Bosnia-Hercegovina is the only point of concern, according to Vance, who believes that the current talks of the representatives of the three national communities in this multi-national Yugoslav republic, is the best way to avoid a possible escalation.

Also, according Vance and his first assistant in this mission U.S. diplomat Herbert Okun, the ceasefire on the Yugoslav fronts, despite sporadic violations, is being maintained. The way things are now, there is no danger for the entire composition of the peacekeeping forces to be deployed, Vance and Okun assessed.

Vance is particularly satisfied with the offers he received from the Yugoslav sides for various benefits regarding the accommodation and transport of the peacekeeping forces. He expressed the hope that this will enable considerable cuts in the expenses of the entire UNPROFOR peace operation, as demanded also in a U.N. Security Council resolution. Vance's assessment is definite that full conditions have been achieved for the peace operation in Yugoslavia to be set in motion. Vance also confirmed that there were no changes in the UNPROFOR schedule, i.e. the entire composition of the UNPROFOR forces may be expected to arrive by mid next month [as received] in the regions in Yugoslavia.

UN Commander Satish Meets Croatian Officials

LD1303041492 Belgrade TANJUG in English 2208 GMT 12 Feb 92

[Text] Zagreb, March 12 (TANJUG)—The commanding officer of the United Nations' protection force (UNPROFOR) for Yugoslavia, Indian Army General Satish Nambiar, today conferred with Croatian civilian and military officials on the forthcoming activites of UNPROFOR whose troops will be deployed in the Serb-populated areas in this breakaway Yugoslav republic.

Gen. Nambiar arrived on a visit to Croatia three days ago. Today he had working contacts with Croatian Vice-Premier Milan Ramljak, chief of the Croatian army general staff Gen. Antun Tus and Interior Minister Ivan Vekic.

Gen. Nambiar again made no statement about his contacts in Croatia. It has only been informed that the talks related to the pace of the deployment and the supplying of UNPROFOR. This evening, Gen. Nambiar and associates paid a visit to the officers of the European Community's monitor mission stationed in Zagreb.

Federal

JNA Buys POW Corpses from Croatians

LD1203120792 Belgrade TANJUG in English 1104 GMT 12 Mar 92

[Text] Belgrade, March 12 (TANJUG)—Yugoslav Army Colonel Miodrag Starcevic said on Wednesday the Army recently had to "buy" from the Croatian side the bodies of 13 of its soldiers killed in the fighting, paying 100 German marks per body. The exchange, as Colonel Starcevic told a session of the Federal Parliament Committee for Human Rights, was carried out through "local chiefs" in the secessionist Yugoslav Republic of Croatia.

Colonel Starcevic informed members of the committee that relatives of many captured soldiers were struggling to find 1,000 marks, the price of their release from Croatian prisons. The Yugoslav defence ministry spokesman yesterday expressed the ministry's dissatisfaction with the way in which the Croatian side was carrying out the agreed prisoner exchange.

According to him, the Yugoslav Army was releasing "direct participants in the conflicts, and in exchange getting mostly elderly people and children."

As an example, Colonel Starcevic set out data on the recent exchange in Bosanski Samac, where 12 of the 25 prisoners handed over to the Army were over 55. He added that there was not much success either in the search for missing soldiers since, in his words, the Croatian side most frequently responded that "there is no information."

Colonel Starcevic announced that as a result of this, the Army would raise the question of its further participation in the joint Army-Croatian prisoner exchange commission, formed with the mediation of European Community observers.

Special Status Requested for UN-Protected Areas

LD1203163992 Belgrade TANJUG in English 1556 GMT 12 Mar 92

[Text] Belgrade, March 12 (TANJUG)—The Yugoslav Government proposed today to the federal parliament to urgently adopt a law on the implementation of the legal system in the part of the Yugoslav territory which is under special U.N. protection. Under the law, the protected territory, due to the effects of the war, would be given the status of an economically insufficiently developed republic. Under U.N. protection is the territory of the Republic of Serb Krajina, which was proclaimed by the Serbs in the areas where they are in the majority on the administrative territory of the breakaway Republic of Croatia, in which they were degraded to the status of national minority.

This law would, it was explained, be in force until a final resolution of the legal status of this territory.

The Serbs living in this territory do not dispute the right of the Croats to seceede from Yugoslavia, but they consider that they are equally entitled to opt for remaining within Yugoslavia. The aim of the new law is, it was said, to secure "the legality of the functioning of the local authorities in the protected territory in keeping with the actual situation" and "to facilitate the implementation of the protective function of the U.N. peacekeeping force."

The U.N. plan on the deployment of the peacekeeping force in this territory envisages that the current Serbian authorities should remain, the Serbian territorials be disarmed and the local police be put in charge of protecting peace and order. The Croatian parliament, however, in mid-February adopted a law under which the Croatian police should control the borders "on the entire Croatian territory." It was also announced that Croatian police stations would be formed on Serbian territories, although a previous attempt had provoked clashes. The law, which was proposed by the Yugoslav Government, also determines the relations between the federal bodies and the authorities of the protected territory. This will, it was said, "enable the federal bodies, in accordance with their constitutional authorizations, to provide the necessary assistance to the competent authorities in the protected territories."

Deputies Demand End to Illegal Arms Imports

LD1203232492 Belgrade TANJUG in English 1733 GMT 12 Mar 92

[Text] Belgrade, March 12 (TANJUG)—Deputies of two Yugoslav parliamentary committees demanded today that competent federal bodies take the "strongest possible measures" to halt illegal arms imports for paramilitary formations. At a joint session of the Committee for Internal Policy and the Committee for National Defence of the bicameral parliament's Federal Chamber, it was said that in Yugoslavia, which was likened to a "powderkeg", so much weaponry had been imported without control in the past two years that it was practically impossible to establish the exact quantity.

The deputies stressed that illegal arms imports should be halted in the Republic of Bosnia-Hercegovina, Sandzak (a region in Serbia half of whose population are Moslems) and the Serbian province of Kosovo and Metohija, which has a majority ethnic Albanian population.

In these areas secessionists are trying to "stir up interethnic conflicts and extend the war beyond the territory of Croatia," it was stressed. A report handed to the deputies said that the "process of illegal arming of party paramilitary formations is almost complete in Bosnia-Hercegovina."

In Kosovo and Metohija, ethnic Albanian separatists have formed local police units which are arming themselves. In Sandzak and some areas in the Republic of Montenegro Moslem paramilitary units have been formed, the report added.

The Republic of Macedonia, which has sought international recognition, is also setting up army formations. In Serbia, party paramilitary formations have been formed and a number of their volunteers have taken part in the war in Croatia. The uncontrolled arms imports started in late 1990 following Slovenia's and Croatia's bids for independence. At the time, the Yugoslav Presidency issued an order on the disarmament of all paramilitary formations but its implementation was blocked by the presidency members from Croatia and Slovenia. In the report of the federal bodies of the state administration it is recalled that the breakaway republics of Croatia and Slovenia "armed themselves in order to achieve their independence in a violent way." The subsequent U.N. embargo on arms imports was not only disregarded but the amount of arms deliveries actually increased.

Croatia and Slovenia receive most of their weapons and other military equipment from Austria, Hungary, Germany, Poland, Italy, Czechoslovakia, Panama and Argentina, according to the report. Yugoslav Army Major General Aleksandar Vasiljevic said that the army had cut off a number of secret arms imports channels, especially those for heavy weapons. Vasiljevic cited examples of deliveries from Hungary, Italy and a number of countries in Europe and the Middle East.

Cooperation in Federal Tank Production Viewed

92BA0605C Belgrade POLITIKA in Serbo-Croatian 26 Feb 92 p 12

[Unattributed TANJUG news report: "Cooperation of Military Industry of Former Yugoslavia: Parts for M-84 Tank Arrive Regularly From Croatia"—first paragraph is POLITIKA introduction]

[Text] It is believed that the Yugoslav military industry will not cease to exist. The G-4M airplane will be completed by the end of the year, while work on two tank projects is continuing unabated.

Parts for the M-84 tank, which is exported to Kuwait, are arriving regularly from plants even in Croatia, TANJUG has learned from the Federal Office for Trade in Special-Purpose Products. Deliveries of tanks to Kuwait, which began before the Gulf war, have not been interrupted, nor have they been disrupted by the war in Yugoslav regions. The Federal Office emphasizes that less than one-fifth (around 17 percent) of the tank is produced and assembled in Croatia. It is known that there is a great deal of interest in the tank on the world arms market, especially since the Gulf war. Around a thousand factories from all parts of the former Yugoslavia are involved in the production and assembly of the M-84 tank. The critical parts of the tank, which give it its exceptional quality, are not produced in the "crisis regions of Yugoslavia," as the office states. For all the other parts necessary for production of the M-84 tank, none of which are technological secrets, there are alternative plants in other parts of Yugoslavia, and they can also be produced abroad without any major problems.

The tested quality and advantageous price of the M-84 tank are the military industry's main trump card in the struggle for foreign buyers. For example, the Yugoslav tank is nearly twice as inexpensive as the German Leopard, which costs around $2.5 million. The Federal Office for Trade in Special-Purpose Products believes that the Yugoslav military industry, connected by numerous business and production ties, will not cease to exist. It is convinced that the business ties will remain in place for current as well as future projects, because the newly independent parts of Yugoslavia have neither the money nor the time to undertake the risky job of developing a national military industry.

As proof of this allegation, the Federal Office notes that the G-4M airplane will be completed by the end of this year, while work on the Whirlwind and B-2001 tank projects is continuing unabated. This new tank will have around 20,000 parts and around 50 metric ton of highest-quality steel. Around 80,000 worker-hours will be required to produce it. It must be remembered that there are only six countries in the world producing tanks. The Yugoslav military industry, united in the Special-Interest Community of Yugoslav Armament and Military Equipment Manufacturers (ZINVOJ), comprises 56 enterprises with around 72,000 workers, 1,500 subcontractors with around 200,000 workers, and around 8,000 researchers at institutions.

Bosnia-Hercegovina

EC Considers Serbian Rejection 'Big Mistake'

LD1303041192 Belgrade TANJUG in English 1738 GMT 12 Mar 92

[Text] Brussels, March 12 (TANJUG)—The European Community (E.C.) has expressed hope that talks on the future of the Yugoslav Republic of Bosnia-Hercegovina (BIH) will resume next week in Sarajevo despite the decision of the Serbian parliament in BIH to reject the E.C. plan on the future internal organization of the republic. The E.C. sources also expressed hope that the decision is not final as this would be "a big mistake." They warned that the Serbian people could find themselves left out of talks on the destiny of a future state and its international recognition. It was recalled that this topic will be on the agenda of the E.C. ministerial conference scheduled for April 6 in Luxembourg. It is not known whether the E.C. will recognize the independence of Bosnia-Hercegovina at the meeting, but well-informed circles in Brussels claim that the United States will most probably do this, despite opposition from the Serbs, one of the three ethnic communities in BIH.

U.S. Secretary of State James Baker proposed at a meeting with E.C. foreign inisters on Tuesday evening, that BIH and Macedonia be immediately recognized as independent states. It is claimed that the European Twelve rejected such a solution. However, "nothing has been lost," it is said, and the Conference on Bosnia-Hercegovina should resume according to schedule early next week in Sarajevo.

'Differing Views on Geography' Hinder Map

LD1203155292 Belgrade TANJUG in English 1405 GMT 12 Mar 92

[Text] Sarajevo, March 12 (TANJUG)—Radovan Karadzic, the leader of the Serbian Democratic Party [SDS], one of the three ruling national parties in Bosnia-Hercegovina, said on Thursday that all participants in the fourth round of the talks in Brussels on Monday on the future of that republic showed their own maps of future Bosnia-Hercegovina. Karadzic told a news conference in Sarajevo that the maps were different due to the participants' "differing views on geography."

The meeting in Brussels was attended by the representatives of the national parties of the three constitutive peoples of Bosnia-Hercegovina—Serbs, Muslims and Croats—as well as European Community [EC] mediators, the Portuguese delegation. Serbs account for 31 percent, Croats 17 percent and Muslims 44 percent of the republic's population. According to a statement by Nikola Koljevic, the representative of Serbs in the Bosnia-Hercegovina presidency, the EC Representatives also showed "its own" rough map which had six ethnic regions drawn in, with around 20 percent of the territory unassigned. Representatives of the SDS in this way denied a statement by the leader of the Muslim Party of Democratic Action, Bosnia-Hercegovina President Alija Izetbegovic, on his return from Brussels that "cartography had not been discussed" there.

Government Proclaims Referendum Successful

AU1203195592 Sarajevo Radio Sarajevo Network in Serbo-Croatian 1800 GMT 12 Mar 92

[Text] The Government of Bosnia-Hercegovina and the Committee for Organizing and Preparing the Referendum on the Status of Bosnia-Hercegovina have established that the referendum of citizens was organized successfully, professionally, and in full conformity with the law and the Constitution. The regularity and the successful organization of the referendum are also confirmed by high marks given by international observers who visited and controlled voting at a number of polling stations.

SDS Claims Irregularities

LD1203154692 Belgrade TANJUG in English 1346 GMT 12 Mar 92

[Text] Sarajevo, March 12 (TANJUG)—The Serbian Democratic Party (SDS) of Bosnia-Hercegovina made public on Thursday the data witnessing irregularities in the conducting of the recent referendum on sovereignty of this Yugoslav republic. According to the SDS' data, announced at today's news conference in Sarajevo, in some localities in Bosnia-Hercegovina there appeared differences between the number of voters who cast their ballots at the referendum and that of the enfranchised. Thus in the Sarajevo principality of Stari Grad, according to figures presented today, the number of those who voted was 38,311, while its registered electorate was no more than 29,271.

According to the official data, at the referendum held on February 29 and March 1, around 60 per cent of the republic's electorate voted for its independence and sovereignty, fulfilling the European Community's precondition for its recognizing Bosnia-Hercegovina.

Towards the end of last year, the presidency and government of Bosnia-Hercegovina sought international recognition without having constent by the representatives of the Serbian nation, one of the republic's three constituent nations. Those who voted for independence of Bosnia-Hercegovina were members of the Croatian and Moslem nations (who contribute 17 and 44 per cent to the republic's population, respectively), while Serbs boycotted the referendum because they had already voted at an earlier plebiscite for staying in Yugoslavia. The noted irregularities are most likely to be brought before a court of law, for, as was said today, Banja Luka Mayor Predrag Radic had already called for criminal proceedings to be instituted over a suspected forgery of referendum results.

Civilians Open Fire on Troops at Capljina

LD1203140192 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 1252 GMT 12 Mar 92

[Text] Capljina, 12 Mar (TANJUG)—The agreement to lift the blockade of the Yugoslav Peoples' Army [JNA] barracks in Capljina and withdraw reservists from this barracks, as well as withdraw a tank unit from the vicinity of Pjesti, which was reached by the Bosnia-Hercegovina national defensce minister, the competent HQ of the JNA, and the organs of authoritiy in Capljina and which was to have come into effect today, has been brought into question because of the unforeseen action of a large group of armed civilians from the so-called self-defense [forces] of the town of Capljina.

Some time before noon today [1100 GMT] on the bridge at the entry to Capljina they stopped a military column made up of peacekeeping soldiers who were to have replaced the reservists in the barracks.

The column moved on accompanied by members of the Bosnia-Hercegovina Ministry of Internal Affairs. Armed civilians opened fire in the direction of the column, but there were no injured and the army did not respond either.

After this incident, the military column withdrew to the Tasovcice suburb of Capljina, where it is awaiting the outcome of negotiations between the civilian organs of authority and the armed civilians, who otherwise so far have not subordinated themselves to the official organs of authority in the town.

The Bosnia-Hercegovina ministers of internal affairs and national defense have been informed about this incident.

Croatia

Serbian Leaders Comment on Refugees, Krajina

92BA0628B Zagreb VJESNIK in Serbo-Croatian 28 Feb 92 p 3

[Interview with Dr. Milorad Pupovac, cofounder of Serbian Democratic Forum, by Branko Podgornik; place and date not given: "'Krajina' Has Never Ceased To Be Part of Croatia"]

[Text] The reemergence of Dr. Milorad Pupovac on the Croatian political scene is yet another incontestable sign that the Croatian-Serbian problem could finally be shifted from the war track to the road of negotiation. Pupovac has always been opposed to war and in favor of political solutions. Last summer in Lipik he was one of the initiators of the founding of the Serbian Democratic Forum (SDF), through which 40 Serbian intellectuals from Croatia tried first of all to bridge the chasm between Serbs in Croatia—between those from "Krajina" and so-called urban Serbs—and then to achieve a Croatian-Serbian agreement. The war interrupted the negotiations, and everything went back to square one, which today is much more difficult and thorny. First of all, the serious consequences of the war must be overcome.

[Podgornik] Is this the reason that you also founded the Office for Refugees, Human Rights, and Rights of National Communities?

[Pupovac] Yes. We decided to establish offices for our own part through which we would assist with the return of refugees, both Serbs and Croats, to areas outside war activities, as well as to those areas affected by war operations. We also decided to establish offices in order that we could protect people from drastic violations of human rights and of the rights of national communities. Our plan was that the offices include SDF representatives on the one hand and a representative of the government and a representative of the EC observer mission or UN mission on the other hand, this to ensure the objectivity of the offices, effective communication in protecting people, and symbolic and actual security and trust among those who would come to the offices.

Returnees—Pioneers of Reconciliation

[Podgornik] What is the goal of the office that you intend to set up in the territory of the "borderlands"?

[Pupovac] The purpose of establishing offices in the opstinas where Serbs constitute a majority of the population and Croats are in the minority is the return of refugees of Croat, but also of Serb nationality. Next, the protection of the human and national rights of all who live there, and especially of the Croats who are at odds with the authorities currently in power there. Unlike the offices that will be set up in areas where the Serbs are a minority, the offices in these regions will have to be in the hands of the Croat population. And the SDF will help to organize them autonomously and with EC and UN assistance. In places from which all the Croats have fled or where only a feeble population has remained, we will, through agreements with the local authorities and the republican government, ensure the return of those who will make preparations for and set up the work of the offices.

For example, in Beli Manastir, in Ilok, in the opstinas of Vrginmost or Benkovac, it is necessary to bring in responsible people who are ready to work, together with their families. They would prepare for the return of all the others by making their property available to them if it has been occupied by someone else or by finding temporary lodgings if the property has been destroyed. And ultimately, by creating the preconditions for reconstructing buildings and settlements wherever they have been destroyed.

The most important function of these people's return will be to bridge the chasm that this war has created in the conscience. Because of this, they will sort of be pioneers of trust and reconciliation. We regard this as so important that we, with the help of the EC and United Nations, which have given their full support to our initiative, will do everything to see to it that this plan begins to take effect immediately after the arrival of the blue helmets. Of course, until then it will be necessary to engage in all kinds of consultation with all sides: with the government of the Republic of Croatia, with EC and UN representatives, and especially with representatives of the borderland authorities. For now, I will only say that they are under way, and that we will notify the public of the first concrete results at one of our press conferences.

[Podgornik] Do you believe that it is possible to reintegrate "Krajina" into the Republic of Croatia?

[Pupovac] Physically and psychologically, the borderland has never ceased to be part of Croatia. The only thing is that this miserable war has created a chasm, both among Serbs and between Serbs and Croats, or rather between the border and nonborder regions of Croatia. Thus, for me there is no question about whether it will be possible to integrate the borderland into Croatia in terms of territory. For me, there is only one question: how to bridge the chasm dug by this war and how to find a political solution in an agreement between the Croat political majority and the Serb political minority in Croatia.

Now that Croatia is internationally recognized, its policy has a special responsibility precisely in this area, in finding a negotiated political solution between the Croat political majority and the Serb political minority. I think that the Hague document and the Hague definition are the basis for this agreement—for which the SDF itself deserves a considerable amount of credit—and that this is precisely the basis on which it will be possible to achieve a stable internal arrangement for the Republic of Croatia after the arrival of the blue helmets, with EC arbitration and mediation.

"We Are All in a Stalemate Situation"

[Podgornik] I also asked you why many people in Croatia are saying that "Krajina" will be returned by force if this cannot be done peacefully.

[Pupovac] I think that almost all of us in the Yugoslav region are in a stalemate situation. Especially after international recognition of B-H [Bosnia-Hercegovina] comes. Indeed, there is not one side that is strong enough to subjugate or destroy the other. And if it is strong enough, then it would have to do so at a horrible, unjustifiable price to its own side. As far as Croats and Serbs in Croatia are concerned, I think that Croatia does not have adequate forces to use them to resolve the Serbian question in Croatia, nor do the Serbs in Croatia have adequate forces to effect the secession of the territories that are currently under their control. Thus—and this was clear to us even before the war—the only solution is to agree on a political solution within the borders of the internationally recognized Croatia.

If by chance someone on the Croatian side were to decide to resume the war out of impatience or anger, then I am afraid that this would in fact call into question Croatia's international recognition. For this reason, a wise Croatian policy today will not risk that for which it has paid dearly, but rather will, if I dare say so, apply a well-organized, long-term political strategy to resolving the question of its internal democratization—which is not limited to the issue of the Serbs—and naturally to resolving the Serbian question in Croatia.

[Podgornik] Will the "blue helmets" favor one side over the other?

[Pupovac] It would be a good thing for the "blue helmets" to come as soon as possible, but also for them to leave as soon as possible. Specifically, there can be no stable peace and stable relations between Croats and Serbs, or rather between states in the Yugoslav region, without a political solution. For this reason, this type of solution must be sought immediately after the arrival of the "blue helmets." Second, the "blue helmets" will cast a shadow over the Serbian nation in Croatia, and no one can grow successfully while living under a shadow. To say nothing of the reasons why it is so necessary to demilitarize the Serbian population in Croatia. Most of the discussion concerning the arrival of UN forces is wrong, regardless of whether it comes from the Croatian or the Serbian side. Specifically, I think that the "blue helmets" should not perform the duties of any authorities, neither the central authorities nor those in the borderlands.

Their duties should cover only three things: the return of refugees and the restoration of life, and the protection of the people's physical and legal safety of the rights of national communities. Everything else should be a matter of awakened interest for different authorities, for different relations among ourselves. Specifically, I am deeply convinced that upon the return of, say, the first group of Croats to Benkovac or the first group of Serbs to Sisak, all those who were guided by extremist solutions will be confounded by one and the same fact: The people will realize that they must look for representatives who will be guided by the logic of cooperation, agreement, and full protection for others.

Christening and Name Changes

[Podgornik] At a recent press conference in Zagreb, you mentioned that 11,000 children of Serbian nationality have been christened in Croatia. Could you explain that?

[Pupovac] There are violations of human rights and of the rights of national communities on both sides. It is also becoming clear that both the Croatian and the Serbian side are trying to hush up the fact that they are violating human rights, and to create the impression among "their own" that only the other side is doing this.

When we bring up cases of drastic violations of the human and national rights of Serbs in Croatia outside the war zones—there are certainly a lot of them, and they are certainly drastic—we are not doing that in order to disparage the drastic cases of violations of the human rights of Croats, nor in order to find a culprit on either side. We only want people to know that there is evil among us. And that because of that evil and the failure of the rule-of-law state to function, people are losing their heads and their elementary human rights.

What is involved here is the fact that several newspapers—ARENA, SLOBODNA DALMACIJA, DANAS—turned their attention to numerous cases of name changes, changes in nationality, and christenings. Imagine a situation in which people, in order that they can live in peace, do their jobs, and in order that their children can stay in school, must change their names, their nationality, and adopt a different religion. In individual schools, the practice is to make a child's attendance in religion class conditional on christening. For many children of Serbian nationality, this can mean only the following: either the onset of social group conflict because he is exhibiting an "odious identity," or actual christening—of someone who has never even been baptized, or from one religion to another.

The information that we heard in a conversation with some responsible Catholic priests, to the effect that 11,000 children of Serbian nationality have been christened thus far, is only a drastic numerical manifestation of what the people and their children are experiencing in this situation where collective guilt and an interest in security are being generated.

[Podgornik] Do you have a concrete example? Should this be understood as a charge against the Catholic Church in Croatia?

[Pupovac] It is hard to talk about the responsibility of institutions; instead, one can talk about social and political circumstances that allow such things to happen. I am deeply convinced that dignitaries of the Catholic Church would not approve of such occurrences, and that they will prevent them to the extent that they exist and sanction them in a certain way.

[Podgornik] Belgrade's POLITIKA wrote that at a recent press conference in Zagreb, you mentioned that VJESNIK is "stirring up ethnic hatred."

[Pupovac] At that conference, the emphasis was on HTV [Croatian Television], not VJESNIK, which POLITIKA reported erroneously. I think that the electronic media today are of critical importance to the democratization of Croatia and to the creation of preconditions for a Croatian-Serbian agreement within Croatia. I think that it is indispensable that HTV be democratized, in terms of both personnel and programming. If we do not do this, then I am afraid that this supposed "cathedral of the Croatian spirit" will become a monument to nondemocracy, which will be identified and easily noticed even from a great distance, meaning from the center whose position has very much interested us.

[Podgornik] During the war, it was heard that you had left Zagreb and gone into hiding in Paris.

[Pupovac] Because of uncivilized attacks against me by certain newspapers, I stayed with friends in Ljubljana for a short time, five or six days. The reason? I wanted neither I myself nor anyone else to get into a situation where, in that sort of atmosphere, we might make the wrong move or say the wrong thing. Otherwise, I have remained in Zagreb. During the period when stories were circulating about my emigration, I was persistently

working at the same job. I was creating the preconditions, both domestically and internationally, for the policy that I have not abandoned and have no intention of abandoning. That is a Croatian-Serbian agreement in Croatia, and ties of communication and interest between the states that have been created or will be created in the territory of Yugoslavia.

Serbia

Milosevic Reportedly Under House Arrest

LD1203222192 Ljubljana Radio Slovenia Network in Slovene 2100 GMT 12 Mar 92

[Text] The Slovene Press Agency tonight published a surprising report in connection with events in Serbia. According to certain sources, President Slobodan Milosevic did not have a traffic accident and is in fact under house arrest. The agency adds that the news will be published tomorrow by SLOVENEC.

The Serbian leader was supposed to attend the conference on Yugoslavia in Brussels, which he allegedly missed because of a traffic accident. According to official Serbian reports, the accident happened on Saturday evening during which President Milosevic sustained light injuries and concussion. The report on the accident was also the last official report on the Serbian president as such. Now there are rumors in Belgrade that Slobodan Milosevic was stopped from fleeing abroad last Saturday night. They are also linking the Serbian president with the disappearance of a large quantity of gold from the Bor mine.

'Small Group' Continues Belgrade Youth Rally

LD1303115292 Belgrade TANJUG in English 1111 GMT 13 Mar 92

[Text] Belgrade, March 13 (TANJUG)—A rally of the youth of Belgrade, staged two days ago to mark the first anniversary of student demonstrations called "Velvet Revolution," continues this morning with a small group of most persistent young people.

They are gathered around a make-shift platform, and the public-address system is much weaker than the previous days. No music is heard and Belgrade residents are passing by. Street sweepers are doing their job, and traffic is back to normal. The organization committee has decided the rally should be transformed into the Assembly of the Serbian Youth or S.O.S. Rade Radovanovic, who is animating the rally, said late last night the S.O.S. would call new demonstrations if their demands for free media are not met in ten days.

The participants of the rally are also demanding the resignation of Serbian President Slobodan Milosevic and the elections for a constituent assembly.

Last night, around 2,000 high school students cheered the news of a column of students coming to join them. As they never appeared, several speakers said in indignation "students have betrayed us, and our parents are scared for the little they have."

They criticized the absence of opposition leaders, expressing particular bitterness about a statement by the Democratic Party, the second largest opposition party in the Serbian parliament.

The Democratic Party says it does not approve the political engagement of juveniles and has nothing to do with urging the pupils to go to the streets.

Youth Assembly Founded

AU1303105992 Belgrade Radio Beograd Network in Serbo-Croatian 0900 GMT 13 Mar 92

[Text] The agreement on founding the Assembly of the Youth of Serbia was signed last night. The signatories are the Democratic Youth, the Serbian Youth Renewal Movement, the Club of Young Radicals, the Club of Young Liberals, and the Terazije Parliament Forum. The Democratic Youth proposed to the people gathered in Terazije Square to join the assembly. As has been announced, in this way the participation of the Democratic Youth in the events at Terazije fountain has concluded.

Party Proposes Formation of 'Opposition Bloc'

AU1103164492 Belgrade Radio Beograd Network in Serbo-Croatian 1400 GMT 11 Mar 92

[Text] Reporters were briefed about the current political situation by the Serbian National Renewal [SNO] at their news conference. The central topics of the conference were the events in Bosnia-Hercegovina and the political scene in Serbia. Party leader Mirko Jovic, and Milica Bizic, member of the party's executive committee, talked to reporters. Zorica Pantelic reports:

[Begin Pantelic recording] The SNO is opposed to a sovereign Bosnia-Hercegovina. The latest events in this region have proved that, as they said, the last phase of the breaking up of the Serbian ethnic territory has started.

This party favors a Serbian federation that would consist of Montenegro, the Serbian Republic of Krajina, Kumanovo and Skopje Montenegro [as heard], Serbian Bosnia-Hercegovina, and Serbia, Mirko Jovic says. He proposes that a public referendum be called on these territories as soon as possible with the question: Are you in favor of a sovereign Serbian state as a federation of the Serbian regions. The SNO would not consent to a single state that would be formed on the Serbian ethnic territories.

Regarding the authorities and the opposition in Serbia, the SNO leader believes that the parties should act in two directions. First, they should exert pressure on the authorities because they have betrayed the national interests and because they are making concessions to the

EC. According to Jovic, the authorities are willing to betray the Serbs in Bosnia and Serbian Krajina to preserve their own positions.

The other direction of activities shoud be the creation of the national opposition bloc in which Jovic, besides the SNO, also sees: Democratic Party, Serbian Renewal Movement, Serbian Radical Party, Serbian Peoples' Party, and from Montenegro the Democratic Party and Peoples' Party. In Jovic's assessment, the present opposition is reformist and does not have the strength to fight the authorities. We do not wish to lose our national determination in the struggle against the communism, was stated at the news conference as was the opinion that the Association for a Yugoslav Democratic Initiative and the Reformist Party [Reformska stranka] should not be included in new opposition bloc. [end recording]

Radical Party Demands New Currency

AU1203164192 Belgrade Radio Beograd Network in Serbo-Croatian 1400 GMT 12 Mar 92

[Text] At his regular news conference Vojislav Seselj, leader of the Serbian Radical Party [SRS], spoke about the new monetary system, the position of the Serbian nation in Bosnia-Hercegovina, the 9 March meeting of some opposition parties, and the celebration of the holding of student demonstrations at the Terazije Fountain. Srdjan Savic reports:

[Begin Savic recording] The SRS demands an introduction of a new monetary union on the territory of Serbia, Montenegro, Krajina, and Serbian regions in Bosnia-Hercegovina. In this way all consequences of the separatist politics of the authorities in Macedonia and Bosnia-Hercegovina would be anticipated, Vojislav Seselj said. This monetary reform should be carried out as soon as possible to avoid the recurrence the problems that were experienced at the time of Slovenia's secession, the leader of the Radicals stressed.

The Serbian nation in Bosnia-Hercegovina does not need to respect the central authorities of this republic, as they have revealed their separatist essence, Vojislav Seselj said. The SRS condemns the U.S. Government for siding with the anti-Serbian politics of the EC and any form of meddling in internal matters. Anyone who advocates the inviolability of Tito's communist borders is taking the responsibility for all the events on these territories, Seselj pointed out.

The leader of the Serbian Radicals in the name of the party expressed pleasure over the fact that the 9 March meeting of some opposition parties was peaceful. However, he was also sorry because, according to him, the Serbian Orthodox Church was used for political purposes on that occasion. At the same time, the SRS condemns the manipulation of underage children for political purposes, which is currently happening at the Terazije Fountain. We support all efforts aimed at reaching the autonomy of the university, but this autonomy excludes any political misuse. The present manipulation of the children at Terazije resembles the conduct of Albanian separatists on Kosovo and Metohija, Seselj said. It is good that neither Belgrade workers nor students responded to all this and that they are not taking part in the demonstration at the Terazije Fountain, which in its essence holds anti-Serbian objectives, SRS President Vojislav Seselj said at the end of the regular news conference. [end recording]

Foreign Minister Comments on EC, U.S. Policy

AU1203220092 Belgrade RTB Television Network in Serbo-Croatian 1830 GMT 12 Mar 92

[Interview with Serbian Foreign Minister Vladislav Jovanovic by Zoran Jevdjevic; place and date not given—recorded]

[Text] [Jevdjevic] Mr. Minister, can you tell us how you assess the declaration by the United States and the representatives of the EC in Brussels on recognizing the independence of the Yugoslav republics?

[Jovanovic] This is a significant document, a significant event in the further development of the Yugoslav crisis and in the further efforts to overcome it. In this way the United States is becoming directly politically involved in following developments and the coordination of future actions with its allies in the EC. From this point of view, this document is politically significant for the quality and the further development of relations between the United States and the EC regarding trends in Europe in general. This is probably the beginning of the reassessment of U.S. policy in Europe after the turmoil that took place in Europe a year or two ago, and this event could be followed by certain moves that would reflect more specific U.S. intentions concerning Europe.

Regarding our crisis, the impression is that its main elements have been identified, the way the community sees them, and that formulations that would render these solutions prejudicial have been avoided. The directions of expectations and even the pressure that would be made to bring the efforts on settling the crisis closer to the desired aims are becoming identifiable, but caution is still present in the sense that all precise formulations are being avoided and room is being left for subsequent development to possibly shape the final form of one or the other solution.

It is also stressed that Yugoslavia as a state entity is not being mentioned. It is only the Yugoslav crisis and the Yugoslav republics that are mentioned. In this way the United States is obviously coming closer to the earlier views of the EC on Yugoslavia as a state that is allegedly in the process of disintegration. One should also note the fact that regarding Bosnia-Hercegovina, it was only stated that one should support and speed up an agreement among the three communities, an agreement that would ensure a harmonious and happy development. The referendum or the results of the referendum are not mentioned at all. Whether this is a correction to the hitherto one-sided and forced policy by the EC on the

so-called Bosnian situation, or whether this is a measure of caution so as not to spoil the prospects of further work of the conference on Bosnia-Hercegovina, remains to be seen.

In any case, it is encouraging that this time the accent has been placed on the consensus, agreement of the three communities, and not on the majority principle, on the decisionmaking by the majority, which is otherwise normal for referendums. There is also a chapter that refers to our republic. It mentions the well-known principles, the unalterability of borders, minority's rights, and adds a new one, namely the principle of succession. This principle has not dominated the work of the Brussels conference so far, not even the EC's declarations, although it was present there in its own way. This time it is being directly tied to our republic and its future behavior, almost as a new political condition.

This document is fairly cautious in this respect, because it is not taking sides, at least at this moment. This is positive in relation to the earlier EC declaration, which, as we know, pronounced a death sentence for Yugoslavia and asked all republics to submit applications for recognition. On the other hand, this document is also a bit worrying, because the condition of the so-called positive conduct regarding succession is only being tied to Serbia and not to other republics.

Whether this as an indication that this question could be resolved in the same way for all republics or not remains to be seen. However, the way the declaration formulated the decision by Serbia and Montenegro to continue joint life in Yugoslavia is also foreboding. Instead of accepting the formulation contained in their decision, that they have decided to rearrange Yugoslavia as the common state in which they will continue to live, the document stated that they decided to create a common state, not mentioning that this state would continue to be Yugoslavia. This could be an editorial imprecision. Let us hope that it is only that. It could also be an indication of a stand that could support secessionists, that is to say the theory of [EC commission head] Mr. Badinter that Yugoslavia has disintegrated and that no one can claim the right to its inheritance. However, if this happens it would cause enormous problems at the conference and seriously burden the settlement of the Yugoslav crisis on the principles of respect for all peoples, recognizing the complete actual situation, and the equal treatment of all options, of all constituent peoples of Yugoslavia, whether this is in support of the creation of independent states or staying in Yugoslavia.

[Jevdjevic] What could then be Serbia's response if the concept that you mentioned as a bad solution is involved?

[Jovanovic] I am personally inclined to believe that the authors of this declaration wanted to avoid any negative surprises in the continuation of the work of the conference and that they, for the time being, are stopping halfway. They are inclined toward the solutions that were even so far close to the EC, but not in a manner that could significantly effect the future work of the conference or prejudice the final solution, depending upon the development of the whole situation.

Finally, the arrival of the United States on the European scene, regarding Yugoslavia, should be an encouragement in the sense that reality in Yugoslavia will be taken into consideration more than it has been so far, as it is well known that the United States is creating its policies on the basis of reality and not on the basis of abstract theories.

[Jevdjevic] How would you comment on a certain move in the official stance of the United Stated, bearing in mind that we have heard the stands of State Secretary Baker few days ago which, to a degree, nevertheless differ from what was adopted in this resolution?

[Jovanovic] Well, these are the reasons of pragmatism and political opportunism. A superpower like the Unites States takes into consideration not only a relatively small country, like Yugoslavia, but also its wider and long-term relations with other factors that are also interested in the solution of the Yugoslav crisis. From this point of view, the United States probably judged that it would be bad for them and their future interests in Europe, if they acted out of sync and uncoordinated with the EC, and if an impression was created that these two world powers, these two world factors, differ on some essential questions relating to Yugoslavia. What they need at the moment, therefore, is to narrow down the differences that are emerging, which does not mean that the differences will disappear nor that they must disappear once they have been narrowed down. They also need to act together to prevent any future derailing of the process by any party in the resolving of the crisis. It is characteristic that the United States favors a simultaneous recognition of all four, or even all five Yugoslav states - if Serbia and Montenegro are counted as a new transformed Yugoslav state—which is a reply to the earlier one-sided politics of Germany, for example, which even favored unilateral recognition without waiting for the agreement with the EC.

[Jevdjevic] Finally, do you believe that these political processes will help or hinder the UN peace plan and the achievement of more permanent peaceful solution for our territory, which would make us all breathe more easily?

[Jovanovic] It was already stated in the declaration that the authors support the double track approach toward the Yugoslav crisis—the peace efforts of the UN on one side and the continuation of the negotiating process on the other. They see this as two parallel processes, which they essentially are. The bottom line is that the purpose of the arrival of blue helmets is, besides the consolidation of the peace and the protection of the existence of the Serbian nation in Krajina, also to create favorable political conditions for the continuation of the negotiating process. This is a goal that everybody has looked

forward to, and we all expect that the parallelism of these processes will give definite results. It is understandable, of course, that the best results would be those that would take into consideration equal rights of all nations and would represent neither an imposition of a solution nor a negation nor a sacrifice of the basic, legitimate national and human rights of any of the constituent nations on the Yugoslav territory.

[Jevdjevic] Thank you, Mr. Minister.

Draskovic Condemns Atrocities by Serbs

92BA0580A Zagreb DANAS in Serbo-Croatian 18 Feb 92 pp 20-23

[Interview with Vuk Draskovic, president of the Serbian Renewal Movement, by Ivan Zvonimir Cicak in Belgrade during the first week of February: "The Serbs Have Blood on Their Hands"]

[Text] Vuk Draskovic, president of the SPO [Serbian Renewal Movement], opposition leader, and Slobodan Milosevic's principal rival, needs no special introduction. During our visit to Belgrade last week, we talked to Mr. Draskovic in his party's headquarters.

[Cicak] The blue helmets are the topic of the day in all discussions. Do you believe that the situation in these parts can be essentially changed by their coming?

[Draskovic] Of course it can, by the very fact that I am convinced that that will stop the war.

[Cicak] In what sense?

[Draskovic] In the sense that the guns will fall silent and will remain silent so long as the blue helmets are here. And they should be here for as long as it takes for the Serbian and Croatian sides to come to their senses and resolve the issues at dispute.

[Cicak] Do you believe there is a real readiness for peace in the political elites of Croatia and Serbia, in the government and the opposition, or is this only tactical deception on both sides?

[Draskovic] I do not know what the governments in Croatia and Serbia are up to, nor do I know what the Serbian and Croatian opposition is up to, I know what I am up to. I truly desire peace. I never provoked the war, nor am I one of those people who believes that anything can be changed in a country through war any more than a leopard's spots can be changed.

[Cicak] But your very political platform, taken from the book *Noz* (*Knife*), has until very recent days been precisely a platform for provoking war.

[Draskovic] Forgive me, I do not know if you have read the book. The book is nothing other than a falsehood, a literary falsehood, of course, which was telling the truth. This is the story about an evil, presumably aimed at condemnation of evil and at our putting by the knife and death, so that we never go through that insanity again. Accordingly, to be silent about an atrocity is to be an accomplice to it. In front of the camp at Dachau, there are the words of the American philosopher George Santayana: "Those who would forget, who would be silent, they would do it again." *Noz* was an outcry against an atrocity.

[Cicak] Your entire platform is perceived precisely the other way about in Croatia, as though you were calling for war.

[Draskovic] I do not know how my political platform is perceived in Croatia, but I do know that 99 percent of those who have crucified me because of my fiction have not read what they were condemning, and I know that the percentage of those who are not familiar with the SPO program is the same.

[Cicak] But you were the first to advocate borders that would go wherever there are Serbian "churches, graves, and burial pits," not "borders of life and human interest."

[Draskovic] No. The SPO program is clear. I even did not dare to publish the program of my party nor to present some of my convictions as a human being and intellectual. That is, what the program says and what I say, and we are saying the same thing.

If a mistake has been committed, it was committed back in 1918, when we created Yugoslavia in the first place.

[Cicak] Here I agree with you completely....

[Draskovic] Or that we Serbs created it in that way. That on that occasion, as a victorious power, we did not round out the borders of our state and then enter into a federation or confederation.

[Cicak] Your regret, then, is that the Serbs did not create an expanded Serbia even then, and so you are trying to do it today?

[Draskovic] I am saying that insofar as a mistake was made, and it was made back then. But it is a horribly dangerous thing to destroy Yugoslavia after 70 years. You should never destroy something whose price, the price of destroying it, may be still greater than the price of building it.

Over 70 years, certain things have been happening on the territory of Yugoslavia. Since there has been a modern economy, since the beginning of this century, this entire Yugoslav space has somehow been built for a unified market, for a house under one roof. From 1918 to 1991, we had nearly seven and a half million kinsmen born in ethnically mixed marriages on the space of Yugoslavia, many of whom are, of course, dead already. At this moment, there are more than a million who are a mixture.

I am talking, then, about certain things which simply should have been a warning to the world. I am saying

that it is risky to get into the business of dismantling Yugoslavia. Taking that principle as our point of departure, we have proposed a range of solutions in the order of which were the most precious to us.

First, a federal democratic Yugoslavia; second, if our partners, the Croats, Slovenes, and the rest, do not want that kind of Yugoslavia, an asymmetrical federal and democratic Yugoslavia.

The third solution, if we could not agree even here, would be to adopt a firm confederation. If even that was not acceptable, we proposed a loose confederation.

The last solution is division, and we particularly emphasized this in the program, publicly stating that this is the worst not only for the Serbs, but also for the Croats, and that sooner or later this would be evident. In that case, we emphasized the principle that Serbian borders be determined according to the ethnic map as of 6 April 1941, before the genocide. The areas in which the Serbs were in the majority before the holocaust to which they were subjected cannot remain within the Croatian state.

[Cicak] You speak of a holocaust. What then do you call what the Serbs are doing now to the Croats in this war?

[Draskovic] Don't talk to me about the last war. We have all been defeated in it. Insanity seized upon everyone, but no one made such foolish and irresponsible moves as the Serbian side. No one is so defeated as the Serbian side and the Serbian national cause in this war.

I have been proclaimed a traitor to my nationality here, for one thing because I said in public that before this war the Serbian people could have found itself in the Revelation of Saint John. It could have seen itself in the position of the lamb, the slaughtered people.

What happened in this war was that Serbian national interests were defended by others, not the Serbian army, there actually was no Serbian army.

[Cicak] But surely the Yugoslav army is Serbian.

[Draskovic] The Serbian army cannot be led by those Serbs who for half a century denied the existence of the Serbian people, who two or three years ago at some seventh, eighth, ninth, and I do not know what meetings proclaimed themselves to be Serbs, realized that they are Serbs, but still do not know what that means. They launched a cheap, a horribly trashy, a shameful Serbism, one that was never native to the Serbian national identity.

That is the Serbism of a people that was never Serbian, of some group that showed itself for the first time in this people, and we have blood on our hands from this war.

As a Serb, I am not interested in how much blood the other side has on its hands. It certainly does have, but that is a problem for the Croatian conscience, the Croatian intelligentsia, the Croatian church, the Croatian people. I said that the lamb had turned dark in the name of my people.

That even, thanks to the atrocities committed unnecessarily in this war, some different name has been given in the eyes of Europe to that genocide committed half a century ago against the Serbian people, and an alibi has been given to those lunatics for what they did half a century ago, and it is the Serbian lunatics who are most responsible for that.

[Cicak] Yet the prevailing opinion in Croatia is that there are no essential differences among you, Micunovic, Milosevic, or others when it comes to the Croatian question. Tudjman has even said that the position of the Serbian opposition is worse than Milosevic's.

[Draskovic] Please don't mention to me what Mr. Tudjman says. After his public statement in which he rescued the Serbian president after the events on 9 March of last year, I have no wish to turn my attention to the words of the Croatian president.

[Cicak] What do you think, why did Tudjman save Milosevic at that point?

[Draskovic] Well, he stated publicly at that time that he had met our president in Karadjordjevo. He said at that time that a certain Mr. Petrovic, and, as you know, that is a very "rare" name in the Serbian people, made an "anonymous" telephone call to him on the eve of 9 March, said he was telephoning from the office of the SPO, and that that "anonymous" Mr. Petrovic was seeking help from the HDZ [Croatian Democratic Community] and the Croatian police. Help in overthrowing the Serbian government. That was supposed to give the idea that Mr. Milosevic is not lying when he proclaimed us to be national traitors, called us rebels, "pro-Ustasha." I really do not want to speak about personalities, and I somehow get mixed up when I do, but I think that an honest medical analysis would establish that there is a high degree of mental and spiritual kinship between the two of them.

Finally, as far as the two of them are concerned, this is probably no longer the case, because Croatia is a sovereign state, but while we lived under the same roof, some kind of roof, there was a kind of siphoning action operating between the two of them. They blew wind into each other's sails, they longed for one another, they needed one another, they kept each other in power, and peace was equally disastrous for the both of them.

[Cicak] You have mentioned Croatia as an independent state. Do you find that easy to take?

[Draskovic] You know what, I must be entirely sincere about this. Yes, of course, in my reason, but emotionally it will still take some time to realize that that is actually the case. We feel like patients whose leg has been amputated, and I have heard that for a month, even for half a year, they say that their toes itch although they

have no leg. Accordingly, we still feel Yugoslavia, but it is not there. That leg has been torn off.

[Cicak] You experience that emotionally?

[Draskovic] Yes. Most Serbs were emotionally bound to that Yugoslavia.

[Cicak] And rationally?

[Draskovic] Rationally, it must be accepted; it is a fact that Ljubljana is a city abroad, that Zagreb is a city abroad. That is what must be accepted, and it is another matter that my emotions are not yet able to realize that when I have a conversation with Zvonimir Cicak, I am talking to a man from another state, and when I read DANAS, and I like to read DANAS, and when I do that DANAS crossword puzzle and chess problem, this was made up by someone in another state.

We speak a similar language, and it is difficult to share that language with foreigners. Aside from that, I think that we look alike, and we are equally intelligent and equally insane. I really think that.

This war demonstrated best how close the Serbs and Croats are. After all, only those who are close to one another can crush and hate one another in this beastly way.

It is no accident that Jesus Christ said love your brother. It turns out that that is really the most difficult.

Again, of course, I am not arguing that we are so close that there is no point in our living in separate states. Who says there is no point? There is a point, perhaps we should have separated earlier.

If a father has five sons, and I incidentally grew up in a patriarchal family, under one roof, trouble arises when they get married. There are cases when the glint of knives occurs between brothers. When they divide up and mark boundaries around their land, and when each builds his own house, and when it is clear what belongs to Jovan, what belongs to Milan, what belongs to Petar, then those quarrelsome brothers begin to live normally. It seems that that should have been done after Yugoslavia was created.

[Cicak] Does that mean that now Serbia ought to recognize Croatia?

[Draskovic] I think that Serbia ought to do that if we want to live together in this region. Alongside one another. Serbia should have been the first to recognize Croatia.

But how can Serbia recognize anyone when Serbia does not exist? That is the problem. First there has to be Serbia. There is no Yugoslavia. There is no Serbia.

There is only the crazed ambition of the Serbian leadership to pull the shroud of a Yugoslavia that now is dead over Serbia as well. To restore the name Yugoslavia to Serbia.

Well, that won't work. I am for recognizing Slovenia immediately, for recognizing Croatia as well. Here I am on the line of the American position. As soon as the UN peacekeeping forces come, when peace is assured and conditions are reestablished for a normal peaceful solution. Croatia should immediately be recognized by resolving the conflict between the Serbs and Croats.

[Cicak] In what borders?

[Draskovic] In what borders? I would recognize the Croatian state without taking a position on borders, that is, in those borders we agree on in that peacemaking process.

[Cicak] You refer to the American position. But their position is that there is no changing of existing borders at all.

[Draskovic] No, I said the American position on when Croatia should be recognized. After all, when the UN forces come and when peace is restored, conditions are created for a peaceful settlement of the problem.

[Cicak] By recognizing all six republics?

[Draskovic] Right. That is also my position.

[Cicak] All six within their present borders?

[Draskovic] I am speaking about that part where I agree with the Americans. But when it comes to the borders in which Croatia is to be recognized and the borders in which Bosnia-Hercegovina [B-H] is to be recognized, we talk about that after the agreement. It is possible that those borders would remain the same, it is possible that we will change them.

[Cicak] By what criteria change borders? Ethnic or some other principles?

[Draskovic] As far as I am concerned, I think that a change of internal borders is indispensable. And that it can work out well only if we agree.

[Cicak] Agree? But Croatia could equally demand in that way that it be given back the "Catholic section" of Vojvodina.

[Draskovic] If we agree, and if the Serbian side consents to that, fine. Everything we agree on is fine. I simply think that some kind of reason argues for certain adjustments of borders. For example, that Knin Krajina be joined to Bosnian Krajina, that western Hercegovina be annexed to Croatia.

[Cicak] Why would the krajina be able to live within the state of Bosnia, but not within the state of Croatia?

[Draskovic] When it does not want to live within the state of Croatia. The krajina has a very bad memory of the entire time when Croatia was sovereign.

[Cicak] At the same time, you in Serbia say that Croatia was never independent nor sovereign.

[Draskovic] This is the first time that the Serbs and Croats will be alone in that region with respect to the state. Never have the Serbs and Croats been alone on the territory of Croatia. There was always some third community of states, some factor which in a certain way supervised their relations or influenced them. At one point, it was Hungary, at another it was Austria, and then Yugoslavia. This is a quite new situation. But even now we will not be alone, even now there has to be Europe, there has to be the United Nations.

I do not know how long that will last, but the agreement reached should be honored. Perhaps I am wrong, but it seems to me that any stability for Croatia also demands some kind of adjustment of borders. By relieving itself of the krajina, Croatia would rid itself forever of a time bomb, it would get a more homogeneous ethnically Croatian territory.

[Cicak] If you are justifying the secession of Knin Krajina by the ethnic composition of the population, what are your arguments for what is happening in Slavonia and Baranja?

[Draskovic] I think I am running a risk once again of getting a fierce beating from my own people. There was no particular need for war in Slavonia and Baranja.

[Cicak] You agree that Vukovar, along with Dubrovnik, is the greatest blemish and shame on the Serbian cause down through history?

[Draskovic] Yes, but also the largest Serbian graveyard in this war. Eighty percent of all those killed in and around Vukovar and because of Vukovar were Serbs.

I was the first in the Serbian opposition and in our people to speak out publicly concerning that shame, and I did so in an article to which I signed my first name and last name.

[Cicak] Even assuming that Serbia attempted to establish itself in the area of Vukovar, do you know what kind of money is needed to rebuild Vukovar?

[Draskovic] I do not think that Vukovar needs to be rebuilt at all. Not that it is too expensive. Vukovar should stand as a monument to insanity. Vukovar is the Hiroshima of both Croatian and Serbian madness. That is what I wrote, and I was beside myself with anger when I saw the army dance the kolo, sing songs, in that city which is a graveyard, that city which is a skeleton, that horror, that hell, that Hiroshima. What are they singing for, what are they celebrating, what have they liberated? I have also written that. Honor demanded, if nothing else, that they remove their hats and keep silent. To be silent and to remain silent.

[Cicak] It was not just the army that was there. There were also paramilitary units, among them those which your party initiated.

[Draskovic] In keeping with our program, we initiated the creation of a Serbian army. That is, a Serbian guard as the core of a future regular Serbian army. We asked the government to recognize those volunteers. To proclaim them regular Serbian forces.

Incidentally, in our program we foresaw a Yugoslavia in which the Slovenes would have their own army, the Croats theirs, and the Serbs their own army. We, then, adhered to that idea. However, the state of Serbia, because we insisted that that be a nonideological professional army, never wanted to recognize those volunteers of the Serbian guard. The Serbian regime would actually be digging the ground from under its feet if it did that. Its strength is in the communist army, the communist police, the communist courts. We were actually striking at its Achilles' heel.

[Cicak] Tell me, how do you account for that constant need to label Croatia neofascist? Even you accused Tudjman of neo-Ustashism a few minutes ago.

[Draskovic] I really cannot be so irresponsible as to call Tudjman an Ustasha or Stipe Mesic an Ustasha. Mr. Paraga I can. He himself acknowledges it and says it of himself.

It is true that there are pro-Ustasha and pure Ustasha forces in Croatia. But it seems to me that that Ustasha idea is nevertheless on the fringe in Croatia.

[Cicak] How long have you been Orthodox?

[Draskovic] Since birth.

[Cicak] But you were also a member of the LC [League of Communists]?

[Draskovic] Even then I was "profoundly" Orthodox.

[Cicak] Does that mean that you were a hypocrite at that time?

[Draskovic] No, that is a tale in itself. It might be said that I was deceiving the Communists. I did not deceive myself, but I did deceive them. I also know why I deceived them.

But I do not even want to think about Serbia becoming an Orthodox Iran.

Second, I do not accept and I object to the sentence: "It is our destiny to carry the cross, and we must follow the St. Vitus' Day commandment." That is a call for us to perish collectively.

[Cicak] A year ago, on 9 March, the Serbs again were historically divided. That is that part of the Serbian tradition in which the Serbian leaders, at the end of their reign or their glory, are thrown out the window, headless, killed by their fellow countrymen who had fought with them until the day before. How do you look on those events today?

[Draskovic] I think that it is fortunate that those divisions have occurred among the Serbs. So that you have a position and an opposition. A strong wind that breaks up

a stagnant pool. Epidemics always develop in a stagnant pool. I am not one of those who is carried away by shouting "Only concord saves the Serbs."

That call was essentially retrograde and in a way totalitarian. What it means is for us all to be like one. God preserve us from all being like one, and of all having just one head. I myself have often been out of step with some of my own views of the same problem. Our conflict of thought, pulling different ways. Imagine a family, any family, in which the principle of unity with head of the household prevailed. So if the head of the household is a homosexual, the entire family must do the same as he does, if he is a madman, then they all act like him, if he is blind, then they follow him.

[Cicak] Do you consider 9 March an important day in recent Serbian history?

[Draskovic] That is the only day worth remembering since I was born.

[Cicak] Does that mean that you are preparing for a repetition of 9 March?

[Draskovic] The 9th of March will never happen again. It cannot repeat itself. But I think it would be a shame not to commemorate 9 March this year, that it would be a shame not to go back this year to the same place at the same time and demand that this regime render an accounting.

[Cicak] Are you not behaving like Tudjman, who just a year ago, after establishment of the HDZ unveiled a commemorative plaque at the place where it was established? Are you not erecting a monument to your own glory?

[Draskovic] We have to get together. Blood was shed at that place, we were murdered, wounded, and beaten at that place. At that place, I heard the most wonderful rhetoric, literature, and it was pure. I do not even know which attack of the police it was when the tear gas was thrown and I noticed a young man who was weeping from the tear gas, and he uttered these words: "God damn you Communists. Serbia has more tears than you have tear gas." Splendid!!!

[Cicak] After 9 March, Babic declared in Knin that up to then he believed that you were devoted to Serbism, but now he sees that you are devoted to power. How do you look today on the division in which Babic is pulling the Serbs in Croatia in one direction and Milosevic in the other?

[Draskovic] On Goli Otok, you had to run the gauntlet. The unhappy victim had to run like a rabbit between two columns, whoever could would hit you and had to hit you. Mr. Babic was saying a few months ago that if Mr. Draskovic comes to Knin, he will be met with at least half a million rounds in his chest.

[Cicak] Have you been to Knin?

[Draskovic] I have taken a public stand toward Mr. Babic's viewpoint. But Babic has been running the gauntlet these past days. I do not want to take part in that exercise.

[Cicak] I hope that this 9 March is more successful for you than last year.

[Draskovic] Thank you, I also hope so. We need to wish that the Croats and Serbs have democracy, reason, a European way of thinking, European intelligence, a European way of trading, a European way of doing business.

It seems that this is the only way for us to overcome our misfortune, the great evil, the abysmal mess that has become an obstacle between us.

Slovenia

Rupel Sends Message to Baker on Recognition

LD1203213392 Ljubljana Radio Slovenia Network in Slovene 2000 GMT 12 Mar 92

[Text] Slovene Foreign Minister Dimitrij Rupel has sent a special message via Dr. Ernest Petric, permanent representative of Slovenia in Washington, to U.S. Secretary of State James Baker. The message refers to the recognition of Slovenia and the joint position of the United States and the European Community which was adopted and published in Brussels.

In his letter to U.S. Secretary of State James Baker, Minister Rupel emphasizes that recognition of Slovenia by the U.S. Government will strengthen the traditionally good relations between the United States and Slovenia and speed up further development of economic cooperation.

Council of Europe Delegation Arrives for Talks

LD1203215292 Ljubljana Radio Slovenia Network in Slovene 2100 GMT 12 Mar 92

[Text] A delegation of senior Council of Europe officials led by Hans-Peter Furrer, director of the Directorate for Political Affairs of the Council of Europe, arrived today in Ljubljana. The visit signifies the establishment of official contacts between Slovenia and the Council of Europe. The leader of the delegation was received by Milan Kucan, while the members of the delegation held a meeting with Dimitrij Rupel, Rajko Pirnat, and Jozica Puhar.

During the talks, it was emphasized that Slovenia is striving for implementation of the aims of the Council of Europe—pluralist democracy and the application of human rights and international law. The Slovene interlocutors thanked the delegation for the support of the Council of Europe.